TWO

LETTERS

To the Most Learned

Janus Ulitius:

WHEREIN

(By way of Vindication) it is abundantly proved, That neither St. *Auguſtine*, nor any one of thoſe Fathers, who flouriſhed in the Ages before him, did, either by their DOCTRINES or PRACTICE, in any wiſe countenance the

Invocation of Saints.

Written by

The Reverend GEORGE MORLEY, D. D. in the Year 1659. while he remain'd in Exile at *Breda*; and when he Publiſh'd this Treatiſe, Lord Biſhop of *Wincheſter*.

Now made Engliſh,

By a Divine *of the* Church of England.

With a LETTER to the Tranſlator, by *Geo. Hickes*, D.D.

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by *John Morphew*, near *Stationers-Hall*. 1707.

TWO

LETTERS

To the Moſt Learned

Janus Ulitius:

WHEREIN

(By way of Vindication) it is abundantly proved, That neither St. Auguſtine, nor any one of thoſe Fathers, who flouriſhed in the Ages before him, did, either by their Doctrines or PRACTICE, in any wiſe countenance the

Invocation of Saints.

Written by

The Reverend George Mora[illegible] D. in the Year 1659. while he remain'd in Ex[illegible] and when he Published this Treatiſe, Lord [illegible] Winchelſea.

Now made English,

By a Divine of the Church of England.

With a LETTER to the Tranſlator, by Geo. Hickes, D.D.

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall. 1707.

A LETTER To the *TRANSLATOR.*

Reverend SIR,

I *Have read your Translation of the Letters which the Learned, and Pious Dr.* Morley, *late Bishop of* Winton, *wrote to* Janus Ulitius, *about the* Invocation of Saints, *with much Delight, not only upon the account of the great Learning, and Strength of Reason in them, for which the Author is to be admired, but because you have made him speak in such pure, proper, and plain* English, *as would have made your Versions been taken for Originals, had it not been known the Letters were written in* Latin. *You had reason in the Title Page to say* Now made English; *for I assure you,* Sir, *without Flattery, they are made* English *in the Perfection of the* English *Language, in an equal, smooth, and familiar Stile, without any Affectation of hard Words, which will make the Discourse in the full force of it intelligible, and pleasant to the less, as well as to the most learned Reader.*

I must also acknowledge, I am very much pleased to see any thing of this venerable Bishop *and old Sufferer, made publick. He was one of those Illustrious* Divines, *and* Confessors *of the* Church of England, *who with equal Courage, and Skill defended their Mother against her Adversaries upon their own Ground, when they were Fellow-Sufferers in Exile with their Sovereign. I may justly say of every one of them, and of your Author in particular, in the Language*

of

of the Son of Sirack, Many ſhall commend his Underſtanding, as long as the World endureth it ſhall not be blotted out; his Memorial ſhall never paſs away, and his Fame ſhall live from Generation to Generation: when he dies he ſhall leave a greater Name than a Thouſand and if he live, he ſhall increaſe it. *Such with him were Dr.* Stuart, *who had he lived, as I have been informed, and have reaſon to believe, had been made Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury, *Dr.* Coſins, *afterwards Biſhop of* Durham, *Dr.* Bramhall, *Primate of* Ireland, *Dr.* Earl, *Biſhop of* Sarum, *and Dr.* Creighton, *Biſhop of* Bath *and* Wells.

Theſe, Sir, *were ſome of thoſe who then overcame the World, and were made Pillars in the Temple of* God, *and it was my Happineſs, as well as yours to be bred when they flouriſhed in the* Church, *to be inſtituted in the Principles which we knew they had practiſed, and to be form'd, or rather reform'd after ſuch ill times by their Examples, as well as by their Doctrines; thoſe pure, primitive Doctrines, in the Profeſſion of which the Faithful Sons and Daughters of the* Church of England *are ſafe, as being thereby embarked in the Ark of the Catholick Church.*

Sir, *You live in a Place where her Adverſaries are buſy and numerous, and theſe Letters will be of ſingular uſe to preſerve your People from being lead away by thoſe falſe Guides, whoſe Practice it is to pretend Antiquity is for them, when it is plainly againſt them, or not at all for them, as may be ſeen by theſe Letters, which, you muſt give me leave to ſay again, you have tranſlated with great Advantage for the Publick Good. I wiſh you would proceed to make ſome other* Latin *Tracts ſpeak ſuch good* Engliſh; *and if you have Time and Health enough at theſe Years for ſuch laborious Performances, you will ſpend both very much to the Glory of God, the Benefit of the* Church, *and to the Satisfaction of all who wiſh well to Her; particularly of*

Your moſt Faithful Friend, and Servant,

LONDON,
May 3d, 1706.

GEORGE HICKES.

To the Most Learned *JANUS ULITIUS*, All Happiness.

Most Learned SIR,

YOUR *Colen* Edition of St. *Auguſtine*, with that of mine own printed at *Baſil*, I have carefully collated, and the Place which you were deſirous I ſhould inſpect, concerning the *Invocation of Saints*, in that ſmall Tract, which bears the Title of St. *Auguſtine*'s *Meditations*, I find to be exactly the ſame in both Editions. So that in caſe that Book of *Meditations* be the genuine and undoubted Work of St. *Auguſtine*, I cannot deny, but that great Doctor of the Church, at leaſt in this one Tenent, is altogether a *Romaniſt*. But firſt, *Eraſmus* (in a ſhort Preface to that Book of *Meditations*) tells us, He neither can aver, nor will he deny, that St. *Auguſtine* is the Author of that Book, but leaves it in Suſpenſe. The ſame thing do the Editors of St. *Auguſtine*'s Works at *Colen*: Nay, even *Bellarmine* himſelf, in that Book of his, concerning *Eccleſiaſtical Writers*, after he has enumerated all and every of the particular Tracts, in the Ninth Tome of St. *Auguſtine*'s Works, (among which are reckoned both his *Meditations* and *Soliloquies*) adds Three ſhort Obſervations: The Firſt whereof is, " That amongſt ſo many " Tracts contained in the Ninth Tome (and there are in it above " Forty) only Seven are undoubted, *viz.* The Expoſition of the " Goſpel and Firſt Epiſtle of St. *John*, Concerning Chriſtian Diſ- " cipline, Of the Ten Strings, Of the Benefit of Pennance, Of " the Shepherds and Sheep, Concerning the Agreement of the " Ten Commandments and Ten Plagues; becauſe, ſays he, all " theſe are to be met with in *Poſſidius*'s *Index*; thereby underſtand- ing that Catalogue which *Poſſidius*, St. *Auguſtine*'s Scholar, com- poſed and publiſhed, of all that his Maſter writ concerning any

Matter. His Second Observation is, " That Four Tracts con-
" tained in that Tome, *viz.* Of the Mirrour, Concerning the
" Conflict between Virtues and Vices, Of the Explanation of the
" Apocalyps, and concerning Antichrist, are notoriously sup-
" posititious. But of all the rest of the Tracts contained in this
Tome, which is his Third Observation, " We have, says he,
" not any thing of Certainty; for neither (as he goes on) can we
" with any Assurance affirm them to be St. *Augustine's*, being
" *Possidius*, the most industrious Collector of his Work, has omit-
" ted them, nor can we find that they are quoted by *Bede*, who
" compil'd his Commentaries upon St. *Paul's* Epistles, out of St.
" *Augustine's* Works; neither yet dare we deny the most of these
" Tracts to be St. *Augustine's*, since the Piety and Learning which
" appears in them are no way unworthy the Character of St. *Au-*
" *gustine*. Thus far *Bellarmine*. Whence even from what pre-
ceeds, it is sufficiently plain that this whole Tract of Meditations,
and consequently that very Testimony out of this Tract produced
to countenance the *Invocation of Saints*, is esteemed but of a doubt-
ful Authority, even by the Chieftains of the *Romanists* themselves;
and from uncertain Premises can we deduce no certain Conclusion.
Whereupon, out of this Book, which does not appear to be
St. *Augustine's*, it cannot be evidently made out, that either
St. *Augustine* did himself Invocate the Saints, or approv'd of the
Practice of it in others.

Nay further, so far as I can perceive it is not only not appa-
rent from these Observations of *Bellarmine* that St. *Augustine* was
the Author of that Book, but it is clear he was not the Author of
it. For in Case (as *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth) *Possidius* was the
most vigilant Collector of the Works of his Master, and yet
makes not even the least Mention of this Tract, certainly it is
more than probable that St. *Augustine* never writ any such Book.
Neither is that which *Bellarmine* adds to the contrary, of any great
Weight, *viz.* That he dares not deny this with the other Tracts
of the Ninth Tome, omitted by *Possidius*, four only excepted, to
be St. *Augustine's*, because they are Pious and Learned, and no
way unworthy the Character of St. *Augustine*, which thing is not
yet so absolutely true, that it may not be gainsaid) for although
these Books be Learned and Pious, yet may they be none of
St. *Augustine's*; unless we should allow that none, but St. *Augustine*
only, are capable of writing what is Learned and Pious; which
thing

thing, I ſcarcely believe, *Bellarmine* himſelf will admit of, ſeeing he himſelf has writ many Things both Learnedly and Piouſly.

Moreover, ſome things there are in that very Book of *Meditations*, which cannot poſſibly have St. *Auguſtine* for their Author, *viz.* that Hymn in his 26th Chapter, compoſed in Rhiming Verſes, which kind of Verſe was unknown in the Days of St. *Auguſtine*, being an Invention of the School-men many Centuries after St. *Auguſtine*, as may be collected from *Sixtus Senenſis* his 3d Book, entitled *Bibliotheca*. For, ſays he, when the School-men were deſirous to provoke the People of their Age, who were mightily given to Rhiming, to the diligent reading of the Holy Scriptures, taking Occaſion from this prevailing Humour, they alſo invented a new Method of Verſifying, which by all Men of Learning was ſet at nought, and quite exploded as Trifling, Superſtitious, and ridiculous. Now then, in Caſe this Rhiming ſort of Verſe was the School-men's Invention, how abſurd it is to father this Hymn upon St. *Auguſtine*, (betwixt whom and *Lombard*, who was the Maſter of all the School-men, more than ſix hundred Years interven'd.) None, *Vlitius*, can better determine than your ſelf, who are a moſt accurate Chronologer; and beſides, to uſe the Words of your admired *Catullus*,

Tanto maximus omnium Poeta,
Quanto ego minimus omnium Theologus.

So much the beſt of Poets you out do,
As the Young Raw Divine I ſink below.

Which Chronological Incongruity and Failing, being taken into Conſideration by thoſe of *Colen*, who were the Editors of your St. *Auguſtine*, they will not have St. *Auguſtine*, but *Peter Damian Cardinal*, to be the Compoſer of that Hymn. But in *Frobenius* his Edition there is no ſuch thing to be met with, as any Diſtinction between the Author of this Hymn, and of the whole Book; and certainly, if at that time of the Day any ſuch thing had been publickly known, neither could it have eſcaped *Eraſmus* his Diligence and Sagacity; nor would it have been conceal'd by ſo real an Admirer both of Truth, and of St. *Auguſtine* as he was. Whereupon it is moſt likely, that the Hymn and the whole Book had one and the ſelf ſame Perſon for their Author; who has out of S. *Auguſtine*

col-

collected many things, whereunto he has added many more of his own, and amongst others are these Forms of *Invocating the Saints*; which seeing they could have no Foundation in the Scripture, nor any Example from the Ancient, and not yet corrupted Church, the Person, whoever he was, that raked together these *Meditations*, that he might claw the superstitious Itch of the Age he liv'd in, counterfeited St. *Augustine*'s Name and Authority. Which Art, by Persons of his Kidney, is practis'd upon others of the Fathers, by interpolating other Works of theirs, thereby to establish and recommend the same and other Errors of these Latter Ages.

Yet in the mean time I will not gainsay it, but in that very Century, wherein St. *Augustine* flourish'd, the Seeds of this Superstition were disseminated, and begun to shoot up; but that St. *Augustine* was himself tainted with this Error, or that there were any such Forms of *Invocating the Saints* commonly received, or Publickly practis'd by the Church of that Age wherein he lived, I deny.

Lastly, with *Melancthon*, a most Learned and Moderate Divine, I confidently affirm, that this mischievous and corrupt Practice of *Invocating the Saints*, (tho' to the Dishonour both of God and the Saints in succeeding Ages, it prevail'd in the Church) was not only unpractis'd, but either unheard of, or otherwise condemn'd, in the Three first Centuries after Christ, nor can there any certain and indubitable Testimony to the contrary, be produced out of the Writings of any of the Fathers, who lived before the Fourth Century. I remit unto you your Book, and bid you heartily Farewell,

Your most Obsequious,

and most Affectionate Friend,

GEORGE MORLEY.

To the Most Learned and Most Excellent

JANUS ULITIUS,

All HAPPINESS.

I Am very much concerned, most Learned *Ulitius*, lest you should account me but an ill Pay-Master, because I am so long in your Debt; but you are sensible we have almost during all this while both of us been from home, and I am no *Bias*, that I can carry all that belongs to me about with me, neither am I a Living Library; and a Debt of this Nature cannot be discharged (at least by a Person of my slender Abilities) without the Assistance both of Books and Leisure.

But that I may now discharge it as far as I am able; whereas there are two parts of your Letter, one of which is a Theological, the other an Historial Disquisition; I shall begin with the Latter of them, as an Argument less momentous, and wherein I shall readily allow my self to be out-done by any Person of Learning, and much more by the most Learned *Ulitius*. True it is therefore what you relate, that when you and I took a walk together, and upon I know not what Occasion, Mention was made of that Fabulous Original of the Ancient *Britains*, as sprung from *Brutus*, the Grand-son or Great Grand-son of *Æneas*, I should say, it made something towards the Confirmation of that Fable, that the *Britains* practis'd the same Method of fighting in Chariots, as did the *Trojans*, and other *Asiaticks*, a thing, so far as I could remember, not made use of by other *Europeans*. I also, by the by, added one thing more, which you take no Notice of, namely, (that whatever should be admitted touching the Original of our Islanders) it was more than probable, they first received the Rudiments of the Christian Religion from the *Asiaticks*, because *Augustin* the Monk, (sent thither by *Gregory* the First, to preach the

the Gospel to the *Saxons*) found the ancient Inhabitants of the Island already Christians, and as to the Celebration of *Easter*, most tenacious of the *Eastern* Custom; neither could he, either by any Menaces or Promises, prevail with them to entertain the contrary Practice of the Church of *Rome*. And this indeed to me seems a Demonstrative Argument, that we owe our first Institution in the Christian Faith, not to those of *Rome*, (as they vainly boast, and thence challenge an Authority and Jurisdiction over us, as due to the See of *Rome*) but to some Apostle, or Apostolical Person, who immediately, or not long after our Saviour's Ascension, landed on these Coasts; and, together with the Christian Faith, taught also these Rites which had obtained in those Places whence he came.

But in the First Place, as to what relates to the deducing the Original of the *Britannick* Nation from I know not what *Brutus*, and so from *Æneas*, and the *Trojans*, there is neither any of our own Country-men, nor Foreigners, who give less Credit to such an Insipid Fable than my self; which thing I then likewise told you. Nor did I alledge that Practice in making War, common to us with the *Trojans*, but unknown to other *European* Nations, that I might thence establish that feigned Genealogy, or Original of our Nation; but only that I might point at what with any Shew or Likelihood of Truth might be urged by the Asserters of it. For, with you, I willingly embrace it as probable that all Islands were first peopled from the next adjoyning Continent, and therefore the *Britains* had their first Rise from the Low Countries, or from some of the *Galls*, or *Germans*.

Further, I own (which upon your Intimation I then likewise acknowledged) that other *Europeans* besides the *Britains*, namely the Ancient *Grecians*, as *Homer*, and the Old *Italians*, as *Virgil* witnesseth, made use of the same Warlike Furniture; which thing, tho' I did not at that instant sufficiently consider, yet could I not possibly be wholly ignorant of it, being I am not so altogether a Stranger to either of these most Celebrated Poets, but that I was well enough acquainted with all those Authorities, which out of them both you either then or now have produced. Wherefore I should readily allow thee no Cogency at all in that Argument by me then urged, in Case it were supported by nothing more than barely Poetic Testimonies; or in Case the Evidence of Poets were alone and of it self sufficient to establish an Historical Certainty in Matters of Fact.

But

But in the first place, not Poets, but Historians are the Material Evidences of Times and Customs, and Matters of Fact, because

——————Pictoribus atq; Poetis
Quidlibet audendi semper fuit aqua potestas.
Painters and Poets claim it as a Law,
With loose bold Strokes to finish what they draw.

as one of the most eminent Poets does not only own, but makes his boast of it. Now 'tis no where to be met with, save in the Poets alone, that the Ancient *Greeks* and *Latins* amongst the *Europeans* practis'd that *Asiatick* Method of fighting in Chariots: But that as well the Inhabitants of *Britain* as *Asia* were accustomed to engage in this Method, is made evident by Historians of undoubted Authority.

Nay farther, those Authorities concerning the ancient *Grecians* produc'd by you out of *Homer*, and concerning the ancient *Latins* out of *Virgil*, have reference to that Period, which *Varro* the most Learned *Roman* stiles, the Mythick or Fabulous Age. For according to Chronologers, *Troy* was subdued by the *Grecians* about the Two Thousand and Second Year of the World, that is, Four Hundred and Eight Years before the first Olympiad; from which Epocha the same *Varro* dates that Period of Time which he denominates Historical, by reason the Transactions thereof were register'd in authentick Histories. So that whatever things are deliver'd to us, as transacted either before or after the Flood by any Authors, who writ before the first Olympiad (excepting the Penmen of the Holy Scriptures) are either Uncertain or Fabulous; and therefore nothing of Certainty or Truth can be collected or concluded from them. For as you your self know, a necessary and indubitable Conclusion does not follow from doubtful and uncertain Premises.

Whereupon, with your good Leave, I may say it, that all these Authorities cited out of *Homer* and *Virgil*, seeing they are drawn out of such Authors, as pretend not an Historical Relation, and do likewise belong to that Age of the World, concerning which we can have nothing of Certainty, are not of sufficient Authority to demonstrate, that the same *Asiatick* Method of making War was practis'd either by the *Greeks* or *Latins*, in common with the *Britains*; because what we have spoken concerning the *Britains* is bottom'd on a more solid Foundation, namely, upon the Testimony of Historians, who flourished within the Historical Ages.

But you will say, Why then should *Homer* suppose that the *Greeks*, or *Virgil* that the *Latins*, did engage their Adversaries after any other Method than what was then practis'd? Why rather attack their Enemies in Chariots, than on Horse-back? I answer, This perhaps might be said by *Homer*, because it appear'd more august and magnificent, and more agreeable to those Heroes, whose Performances he relates, to Charge sitting conspicuous in a Chariot as upon a Throne, rather than barely on Horse-back, like a common Soldier: Or otherwise, because in those very times, wherein *Homer* writ these things, the *Asiaticks* made use of these Manner of Chariots in their Wars, and he was not willing his *Greeians*, during the time of Action, should be outdone in Arms, and other Military Equipments, by those very Persons, over whom, in the Conclusion of the War, they were to be Conquerors. And then the same things concerning the Heroes of the same Ages are related by *Virgil*, because in every thing he labours to imitate and copy after *Homer*. Now in Case Military Chariots had been in use amongst the *Grecians* in the times when *Homer* writ, it is altogether unaccountable that none of the *Greek* Historians should hand it down to us, seeing *Homer* (according as *Suidas* and *Porphyrie*, and your Country-man the excellent *Vossius* out of *Suidas* witness) lived before the first Olympiad, that is, before the Conclusion of the Fabulous, and the beginning of the Historical Ages, not past One Hundred and Thirty Years; and that not only the Use of such like Chariots should become obsolete, but even the very Memory of them, that ever at any time any such thing had been in use, should within the Compass of so short a space absolutely perish, is a Matter scarcely, if indeed at all, credible.

Wherefore, what you relate concerning *Cæsar*'s taking Notice of this Method of making War out of Chariots amongst the *Britains*, not without some Admiration, is true, not only, as you conjecture, upon account of their Dexterity in Charging, their Activity in Wheeling and Vaulting, (tho' even upon that Account the thing was more to be wonder'd at) but also upon the Account of the absolute Newness of the thing, such as before he had no where seen, and which, as he could not believe it the Invention of a Nation so much above others unpolish'd, so neither could he imagine when, or how, so many Ages ago, or from Places so vastly distant, as either from *Asia*, or *Greece*, or *Italy*, it should be imported hither. And from what by way, as it were, of

Self-

Self-correction you add, that what occaſion'd *Caſar*'s Admiration might poſſibly be his obſerving that ancient Method of making War, both in *Italy* and elſewhere now diſcontinued, and quite antiquated, ſtill kept on foot in theſe Parts, the Conſequence is, that that Method of making War had obtained in *Britain* before it was diſcontinued in *Italy*, becauſe otherwiſe it cannot with Propriety of Speech be ſaid ſtill to be preſerved, after it was quite antiquated in *Italy*. Now in Caſe at any time it obtain'd in *Italy*, it was diſcontinued before *Rome* was built, becauſe *Livy*, who hath compil'd his Hiſtory from the Building of the City, never takes Notice of any ſuch Cuſtom. Now in Caſe it prevail'd in *Britain* before *Rome* was built, why may we not believe it brought over into *Britain* by ſome of the *Trojans*, by whom it was firſt introduced into *Italy*?

For, whatever *Virgil*, or *Servius*, or *Strabo* may ſay concerning that Matter, I cannot eaſily believe the *Britains* were taught the Uſe of theſe Military Chariots from the *Belgi*. Firſt, becauſe the *Belgick* Wagons, concerning which *Virgil* ſpeaks, and which *Servius* tells us were invented by the *Belgi*, ſeem to have been no warlike Utenſils, but Carriages relating to Husbandry, and are not therefore mention'd by *Virgil* when he treats of Warlike Affairs, but in his Georgicks; that is, in the more proper Place. And then, as to what relates to *Strabo*, though he is a Witneſs worthy Credit, eſpecially when he deſcribes thoſe Places, and their Inhabitants, whither he himſelf had travelled and ſeen, (and many both Places and People did he ſee) yet nevertheleſs might he have been impoſed upon, and draw others, though not wilfully, into the ſame Error with himſelf, when he relates ſuch Matters, which he had only receiv'd by Hear-ſay; upon which Authority, as he himſelf confeſſeth, many things are by him deliver'd. And a ſlip of this Nature does that Teſtimony ſeem to be, which you quote out of him, that you may prove not only the *Britains*, but ſome of the *Celtæ*, (whom you term *Belgians*, though *Cæſar* plainly diſtinguiſheth between the *Celtick* and *Belgick Galls*) employed theſe ſort of Chariots in Military Affairs. For certainly *Caius Cæſar* (who not only took a narrow View of the whole Country of the *Galls*, but over-run it with his Wars and Conqueſts) could not be ignorant of this Method of making War amongſt the *Celtæ* or *Belgi*, nor would he have conceal'd it, in Caſe at that time any where among the *Galls* any ſuch thing had been practis'd; much

leſs was it agreeable to an Author of ſo much Circumſpection and Method in deſcribing his own Tranſactions, to make a Wonder at the ſelf ſame Method of making War, as at a thing entirely new, which he had firſt of all ſeen in *Gall*, and afterwards ſaw in *Britain*, and with ſuch Variety of Words ſo to deſcribe it, as to render it intelligible to others. Whereupon either the *Celtæ* made no uſe at all of theſe Military Chariots, or in caſe they did, it was after *Cæſar*'s being amongſt them, namely, within that Period of time which elapſed between the *Gallick* War and *Strabo*'s Writing theſe things, that they were firſt made uſe of. Whence it is manifeſt, that the *Britains* could not be taught the uſe of theſe Chariots by the *Belgi* or the *Celtæ*. But it ſeems more agreeable to Truth, that the *Celtæ*, while they ſerved under *Cæſar* in his *Gallick* Wars, ſhould from the *Britains* learn that Martial Art, which they ſaw by them practiſed, and afterwards themſelves make uſe of it in their own Country. Which thing even *Strabo* himſelf ſeems to intimate, when in the firſt place he relates this as the Practice of very many of the *Britains*, and afterwards ſays, that only ſome few of the *Celtæ* made uſe of it; now every Cuſtom ſeems longeſt to have obtain'd in that Place, where there are many and skilful, rather than where there are but few and bungling Practitioners of it.

Strabo (according to Voſſius*) writ about the Beginning of* Tiberius's *Reign.*

Which thing, the moſt Ingenuous *Ulitius*, according to his wonted Ingenuity, ſeems to have foreſeen and provided againſt, when, out of *Tacitus*, you labour to make it appear, that not all the *Britains*, but only ſome ſort of the *Britannick* People, namely, thoſe Northern Inhabitants beyond the River *Tay*, and the Mountainous Tract of *Braid Albin*, did engage their Adverſaries in theſe ſort of Chariots; which thing, however true it might be in thoſe Days when *Tacitus* writ the Life of his Father in Law *Agricola*, certainly there was no manner of Truth in it, when *Caius Cæſar* landed on the Shoars of *Britain*. For he firſt landed his Soldiers in *Kent*, a Place very remote from the River *Tay* and the Mountains of *Braid Albin*, and yet even in theſe very Places did he meet with theſe Military Charioteers; and though he advanced not very far beyond the River *Thames*, yet did he often engage with Enemies, who made uſe of ſuch Military Equipments; and there is no doubt to be made, but that from *Thames* even unto *Tay*, and wherever the Iſland extended it ſelf,

the

the ſame Methods of waging War were at that time practis'd by the Iſlanders. Wherefore that you may not oppoſe *Tacitus* to *Caſar*, but that each of them may have that Credit given them which they well deſerve, it ſtood you (my good Friend *Ulitius*) in good ſtead to have reflected on what you your ſelf in the Period immediately preceding had acquainted us with, namely, that after the *Britains* had for ſo long a ſpace, (to wit, from the Days of *Julius Caſar* to thoſe of *Domitian*) experienced and imitated the *Roman* Exerciſe of War, their own, by little and little, began to be diſcontinued; and that firſt, and with greater Proficiency, in thoſe Parts of the Iſland, which were neareſt and moſt expos'd to the Camps and Fortreſſes of the *Romans*; till the *Romans* making themſelves at length Maſters of all every where throughout the whole Iſland, and together with the Contributions, exacting from thoſe they had ſubdued the Exerciſe of the *Roman* Arms, the antient Method of making War in Chariots, as you very well obſerve, was abſolutely diſcontinued and worn out of uſe.

And thus (moſt Learned *Ulitius*) have you, ſuch as it is, my Return to the firſt part of your moſt Learned Epiſtle, or indeed, rather my Apology, (I will not ſay for the Truth,) but for the Likelihood of that Argument, which, during the time of our walking together, I offer'd to ſupport, as I confeſs, a falſe Hypotheſis, not ſeriouſly, but for Diſputation ſake. And therefore what I have now added, I would have you well aſſured to be by me written in the ſame ſtrain, namely, not out of any Deſign of diſſenting from you, (for touching the Original of the *Britains*, my Sentiments are the very ſame with yours) but only after a Logical and Academical manner to make an Experiment, of what on either part of an Argument may be offer'd with any probability, a thing in ſome Caſes neither unpleaſant, nor altogether unprofitable. Which thing, nevertheleſs, I make it my Requeſt you would not ſo interpret, as if it were undertaken by me with any Deſign to vie with you in Critical or Hiſtorical Matters, or indeed, in any other ſort of Polite Literature; but only that I may not appear a mere inſipid Perſon, and as if Humanity were a Study perfectly foreign to me, and upon that very Score unworthy your Friendſhip.

But it is now high time that I addreſs my ſelf to the ſecond part of your Letter; which ſeeing it appertains to Matter of Faith and Religion, does require a more ſerious and adviſed Diſquiſition

tion. Tho' I am fully satisfied, you as little approve of the *Invocation of Saints*, as I do of that Romance concerning *Brute*.

Concerning Prayer for the Dead.

In the first place, therefore, what you seem to confound, it is necessary to distinguish, I mean between the *Invocation of the Saints* (concerning which thing alone we debated) and the Invocation of God in Behalf of the Dead; touching which matter, neither did you formerly start any Difficulty, nor did I say any thing relating to it. For neither is it the same thing, nor falls under the same Consideration, *To pray unto, and to pray for those who are departed*; but they are two things, and such two, as though they be not Contraries, so as they mutually destroy each other, yet are they so Diverse, that there is not in the least any necessary Connexion between them; so that allowing *Prayer for the Dead* to be in some Sense Lawful, and of good Antiquity, yet would it not follow, but that *Invocation of Saints* may both be a Novel and Impious Doctrine. And in very deed, *Prayer for the Dead* is of far greater Antiquity, and much less deserves Censure than *Invocation of the Saints*.

But then do I not intend such Prayer for the Dead, as is now practised by the *Romanists*, nor bottom'd on such a Foundation, as is that witty and gainful Invention of *Purgatory*. For from the Practice of the Ancient Church in *Praying for the Dead*, it can no way be proved (though the *Romanists* do falsly suppose it, and take it for granted) that these Primitive Christians did believe the Dead for whom they pray'd were tormented in such a Place as they dream of, or that it was possible to free them from that Place, and those Torments, by the Intercessions of the Living. For *Tertullian* is the first amongst the Ancients, wherein the Practice of *Oblations* and *Prayers for the Dead* is to be met with; but he never once thought of this *Popish Purgatory*, or of any other third Place of Receptacle of such Souls as were separated from the Body; for in his fourth Book against *Marcion*, and concerning the Soul, he has assign'd only two Places, as Receptacles for Souls deliver'd from the Body, wherein they are, as it were, reserv'd to the Day of Judgment, namely, the Infernal Lake for the Reprobates; but for the Souls of the Just *Abraham*'s Bosom; which, he tells us, is not Heaven it self, yet is it above Hell; in the interim, the Souls of the Just do therein receive Comfort, untill the Consummation of all things does (as he is pleased to express it) cancel the Resurrection, by the Fulness of the Retribution; that is,

ren-

renders, ſo far as Humanity is capable, our Bleſſedneſs compleat; taking this metaphorical Expreſſion from the Method of Accomptants, who all along cancell their Figures, till having drawn all the Particulars into one Total, they cancell all but that Total.

But you will ſay, Why therefore, or to what Purpoſe, was that moſt ancient Practice of *Offering* and *Praying for the Dead* continued in the Church? Or what manner of *Oblations* and *Prayers* were theſe? I anſwer you, that by *Oblations for the Dead*, as practiſed by the Primitive Church, we muſt underſtand only Eleemoſinary, not Propitiatory or Expiatory Oblations, (for ſuch were only to be offered by Prieſts, not Lay-men, much leſs by Women.) For *Tertullian*, in his Book concerning *Single Marriage*, tells us, that the Wife made Oblations for her Husband on the Anniverſaries of his Deceaſe; and likewiſe in his Book of *Exhortation to Chaſtity*, he ſays, the Husband offer'd his Annual Oblations for his Wife; neither of which could have been perform'd, in caſe the Sacrifices which either of them offered had been Propitiatory. They were therefore Euchariſtical, namely, Charities beſtowed upon the Poor, which the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* calls *Sacrifices*, and ſuch Sacrifices, *with which God is well pleaſed*. And that theſe Charities which were diſtributed for the Relief of the Poor, were by the Ancient Church denominated and reputed thoſe very Oblations, is moſt apparent from the 85th Canon of the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, *Whoſoever do either abſolutely deny, or not without Reluctancy pay unto the Church the Oblations of* (that is, for) *the Dead, as Deſtroyers of the Needy, let them be Excommunicated*. So that to make *Oblations for the Dead*, according to the Senſe of the Ancient Church, was nothing elſe than Charity beſtowed on the Poor, as an Expreſſion of their Gratitude towards God, in that he had vouchſafed to releaſe the Souls of the Godly from the Priſon of the Body, and for their Deliverance from the miſerable and dangerous Eſtate of this Life, and as *Tertullian* expreſſeth it, for tranſlating them to a Place of Repoſe and Refreſhment.

But, ſay you, in caſe pious Souls, immediately after they are departed from the Bodies, are in a State of Refreſhment, what need is there for Prayers upon their Account? as if indeed there could not, or that it were not cuſtomary there ſhould be Euchariſtical Devotions. Now ſuch moſt certainly were the Prayers, wherein the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, and Martyrs were commemorated at the Altar, concerning whoſe happy

happy State there could be no Doubt, and upon whose Account, as St. *Augustine* speaks, it was injurious to pray, that is, after any other Form than what was Eucharistical. Yet do I not deny, but that amongst the Ancients, besides these Eucharistical, there were in the *Office for the Dead* also Intercessory Prayers, wherein something seem'd to be desired or pray'd for upon the account of the Dead, as if, even yet, something were wanting to them. For *Tertullian*, speaking of these kind of Prayers, says, *Devout Christians prayed, That the Souls of such as were dear to them might enjoy Refreshment*; but these very Souls, according to the same *Tertullian*, either were already, or otherwise, never at any time hereafter should be in a State of Refreshment, seeing from Hell there is no Redemption, nor any Mitigation of the Infernal Torments; and besides Hell and *Abraham*'s Bosom, *Tertullian* allows not of any third Place as a Receptacle for Souls in a State of Separation. It therefore remains, that we may conclude the Ancients thought it possible that we might piously, and without Impenitence, petition God for something, which we believed was already granted by him. For such indeed is the Condition of Humane Frailty, especially in Matters relating to Faith, that concerning such things as we desire with Earnestness should be accomplished, we can never think our selves enough, however, never too much ascertain'd and secur'd, whilst we continue alive. And from hence proceed these so frequent and importunate Petitions of *David*, *Daniel*, and other holy Persons in the Sacred Scriptures, which are addressed to God, that he would fulfill what he had promised, and that he would accomplish the thing which he had taken upon himself, and the like, all which things they were beyond all doubt abundantly assured would be brought to pass.

But, you will say, however certain such things may be, yet were they neither present, nor already past, but still future; and betwixt what is past, and what is yet to come, there is a wide Difference; for to petition for the Accomplishment of any thing, which we know to be already effected, does not only seem absurd, but directly impossible; and such indeed it is, in Case we be perfectly assured, that what we desire of God to perform, is already performed by him. But to Know and to Believe are two different things. For where there is Knowledge, there also is Certainty, and such Certainty as quite takes away all Doubtings, as well upon the account of the Person who knows the thing, as upon the Mat-

Matter known: But where there is only Faith, there, though there be an infallible Certainty of the thing believed, yet is there not such an indubitable Certainty in the Party believing, or such a Plenitude of Perſuaſion in the Believer, but that ſtill there is room for his Wiſhes and Prayers, according to that in the Goſpel, *Mark* 9. 24. *Lord I believe, help thou my unbelief.* Upon which account he, who throughly knew our Infirmities, has taught us daily to petition for the Forgiveneſs of all our Treſpaſſes, how often ſoever we have heretofore been penitent for them; ſo that by Chriſt's own Ordinance we are inſtructed to petition, that ſomething which is already performed, may, as it were, be again accompliſhed; for to ſuch who Repent and Believe, all their Treſpaſſes are forgiven and yet nevertheleſs the moſt ſincere believing Penitents ought daily to pray, that their Treſpaſſes may be forgiven them, and even All their Treſpaſſes, and not barely thoſe which they daily commit. Now in caſe it be lawful to petition for the Forgiveneſs of our Treſpaſſes, which already are forgiven us, why ſhall it not be alſo lawful, to pray for Happineſs for thoſe, who even now enjoy it? and whom, even before we offer up our Petitions in their Behalf, we our ſelves believe in a State of Happineſs?

Moſt aſſuredly he whom you intimate by a certain Perſon, practiſed this very thing upon the account of his Mother *Monica*, namely, praying (upon the very ſame grounds by me before mentioned) for her Salvation, whom he believed in a State of Bliſs, as is plain from that very Place by you alledged; where he does indeed petition for his Mother already departed, that God would forgive her her Treſpaſſes. But I pray conſider well of what in expreſs Words he immediately ſubjoins; and *I believe*, ſays he, *what I petition for, thou haſt already performed, but accept the Free-will-Offerings of my Lips*; that is, permit me, out of the Abundance of my filial Affection to the beſt of Mothers, thus to expreſs my ſelf. Where alſo it is well to be regarded that the Conjunction copulative *And* is not ſuperfluous, but very emphatical; for it implies as much as if he had ſaid, I do indeed petition, as for a matter not yet accompliſhed, and yet do I believe that it is already compleated; for I cannot otherwiſe than believe, that ſhe who ſo lived, is even now in a State of Salvation, for thus my holy Faith and Charity command me to believe; and yet can I not forbear, even ſtill to pray, that ſhe may be ſaved, becauſe ſo the Force of my weak Nature conſtrains me. *Confeſſ. l. 9. cap. penult. & ultim.*

When therefore, in the preceding Chapter he tells us, *The Sacrifice of our Redemption was after her deceaſe offer'd for her*, it cannot poſſibly be ſo underſtood, as if it were offered for the Expiation of her Sins, becauſe, as he himſelf tells us, he believed them already expiated; but only that during the time of Celebration, ſhe might be commemorated amongſt others, who ſlept in the Lord, that is, in the Belief of that Sacrifice which our Lord offered for the Expiation of Sin; for this is that very thing, which, when ſhe was about to dye, ſhe had her ſelf requeſted, namely, that even after her Departure ſhe might be accounted a Member of Chriſt's Body, and might be enrolled as one of their Number, who, by one and the ſelf ſame, to wit, by that only Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt once offered, were all of them redeemed from their Sins to Salvation, from Death to Eternal Life. For in this Senſe, and chiefly upon this Account, was the Commemoration of the Dead uſually perform'd, during the Adminiſtration of the Holy Myſteries; namely, that from that Practice it might be underſtood, that all Saints, as well thoſe who were departed this Life, as thoſe who continued ſtill in it, did appertain to the ſame Body, nor was it in the Power of Death it ſelf to ſeclude them from the Unity of the Church; and further, that there neither is, nor ever was any one ſo Holy and Innocent, but that he ſtood in need of the Merits of this Sacrifice to expiate the Guilt of his Sins, and to render God appeaſed and propitious to him, whether he were Patriarch, or Prophet, or Apoſtle, or Martyr, or even the Mother of our Saviour herſelf, for the Names of all theſe were recited at the Altar; not that then after Death, but that heretofore whilſt they remain'd amongſt the Living, they ſtood in need of this Sacrifice. So that allowing this Cuſtom of *Praying* and *Offering for the Dead* to be in this Senſe practiſed by the Ancients, there is nothing either of Obligation or Argument can be drawn from thence, to countenance the preſent *Maſſes* and *Prayers for the Dead*, in that Senſe wherein they are now celebrated amongſt the *Romaniſts*. For thoſe of the *Romiſh* Communion intercede for, and celebrate their *Maſſes*, upon the account of ſuch Perſons, as they believe to be in Torments; whilſt the Ancient Chriſtians Prayed and Offered for thoſe, whom they believed in a State of Refreſhment.

And this (as I have above-ſaid) they might do out of a pious Inclination to wiſh thoſe Perſons Happineſs, whom, they hoped, even then enjoy'd it; or out of a Deſire to promote them from a lower

lower to an higher Degree of Bleſſedneſs. For many of the Primitive Fathers, as *Juſtin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Lactantius*, *Victorinus Martyr*, and others, did not ſuppoſe the Souls of the Juſt went hence directly to Heaven, but that they were detained in *Abraham*'s Boſom, or in ſome other Place of Refreſhment, even unto the Day of the laſt Judgment; ſo as in the mean time they were not made Partakers of the Beatifick Viſion, or compleat Happineſs, which by God's Promiſe, through the Merits of Chriſt were due to them. Whereupon, this being their Opinion, it was in them no Solœciſm to beſeech God on their Behalf, that he would haſten that Day, wherein he had determin'd to crown his Saints with the Fullneſs of Redemption.

Nor even to us alſo is it either unlawful or unprofitable to *Pray for the Dead* in ſome Senſe; for though we are not concluded by that Opinion of the Ancients, that the Souls of the Saints are not admitted into Heaven till the Conſummation of all things; yet being the Soul is only part of the Man, and to compleat the Felicity of humane Nature, 'tis neceſſary that the whole and entire Subſtance, and every part thereof, ſhould be bleſſed, which thing, before the Reſurrection of the Body, cannot be accompliſhed; therefore, do I ſay, that to us alſo it is lawful, as well upon our own, as alſo upon the Account of thoſe who are departed, to interceed with God, (which thing, according to the order for the *Burial of the Dead*, preſcribed by the Church of *England*, we conſtantly do) praying, *That it may pleaſe him of his gracious Goodneſs, ſhortly to accompliſh the Number of his Elect, and to haſten his Kingdom, that we, together with our Brother*, then interr'd, *and all thoſe who are departed this Life in the true Faith and Confeſſion of the Name of Chriſt, may have our perfect Conſummation and Bliſs, both in Body and Soul, in God's Eternal and Everlaſting Glory.* Which very Form of Prayer, together with the preceeding Form of Thanksgiving (with us alſo accuſtomarily made uſe of) for the Delivery of the Party then interr'd, out of the Miſeries of this ſinful World, as alſo that Admonition touching the Frailty and Miſery of this preſent, and the Immortality and Felicity of the future Life, taken out of proper Places of Holy Scripture, and publickly read in the Preſence of ſuch as attend the Interment, (all which are enjoyned by the Liturgy of the Church of *England*) I eſteem to be either altogether the ſame, or however very little different from that Ancient Practice of *Oblations* and *Prayers for the Dead*, when taken according to the Primitive and Genuine Intention

of it. Especially, if we add thereto those charitable Distributions which, with us, 'tis accustomary to make at Funerals, and which, in our common Country Language, are called Doles.

But it must not be gainsaid, but that this more ancient and wholesome Intention of *Praying* and making *Oblations for the Dead*, or in Consideration of them (which we yet retain in our Church) after the third Age, gradually begun to be corrupted; so that even St. *Augustine* himself, falling into Ages which more and more declined towards Superstition, was in some measure over-born by the Multitude, which always with Violence pursue what is worst; for when he ranges those who are deceased into three Orders, namely, some very Good, others very Evil, and a third Rank, as it were, in the middle betwixt these two Extremes, and considering with himself that the Church made use of one and the self same Form of Prayer for all that were departed, he so distorted these Petitions to a Sense quite foreign to the Judgment of the Primitive Fathers, that it is not to be denied, but that, while he reasons concerning a third Place, between the Receptacles of the Blessed, and of the Damned, though he deliver this faintly, and with Diffidence, and only by way of Disputation, he lays some Grounds for the *Romish Purgatory*. For in one Place he tells us, *The Souls of the Deceased who had led their Lives piously were delivered from Purgatory*; but in another Place, *Whether there be a Purgatory or not, he dare not determine*. For *Book* 21. *Chap.* 26. of his *City of God*, *Peradventure*, says he, *it is true*. And in *Chap.* 69. of his *Manual*, *That there is*, says he, *some such thing after this Life, is not incredible, and whether there be or no, is matter of Debate*. Lastly, to *Dulcitius* he repeats the same things, and concerning this, and Questions of like Nature; *We*, says he, *have given an account of these Matters, yet after such sort, as not Canonically to determine any thing concerning them*. Whence it may be collected, that either St. *Augustine* did not acknowledge the History of the *Maccabees* for Canonical Scripture, or that his Opinion concerning *Oblations for the Dead*, bottom'd upon that History, was not sufficiently conclusive, or that (at least in this particular Opinion) he was not absolutely fix'd in his own Judgment. However this be, certain it is, that St. *Augustine* determined nothing concerning *Purgatory*, much less did either he himself entertain it as a Doctrine of Faith, or would have other Persons so account of it; yea rather, when in express Words he derogates from the Canonical Authority of *Purgatory*, it is apparent, that whatever were his Sentiments con-

cerning

cerning it, yet does he absolutely deny it to be a Matter of Faith; whereupon, so little does he add any Authority to the *Romish* Opinion concerning *Purgatory*, that he altogether impugns it.

Concerning the Invocation of Saints.

But whatever St. *Augustine*, St. *Ambrose*, or *Epiphanius*, or *Chrysostome*, (though *Epiphanius* in that Disputation against *Aerius* comes nearer to the more Ancient than latter Fathers) might either think or write concerning the *Prayer* and *Oblation for the Dead*, yet will it not thence follow, that either St. *Augustine*, or any one of the others, was an Advocate for the *Invocation of Saints*; for *Invocation of Saints* has nothing in common with *Prayers for the Dead*: And further, *Prayers for the Dead* (as I have said before) is in some Sense lawful, but *Invocation of Saints*, take it how you will, is absolutely and altogether unlawful; the former only impertinent or superstitious, but the other Idolatry, and a Contempt of God, or Christ, if not of both. For all *Invocation* (as the *Romanists* themselves are wont to distinguish) is either Supreme, and Direct, and Absolute, and Terminative, or Subaltern, and Indirect, and Relative, and Transitive, or by the Ministry of one relating to another. And concerning that *Invocation* which is Supreme, Direct, Absolute, and Terminative, the *Romanists* themselves confess, that it is what they call *Latria*, or that kind of Worship which is due to God alone; and therefore *Invocation of Saints*, in case it imply a Worship of this Nature, is in very deed Idolatrous. But then *Invocation* Subaltern, Indirect, Relative, and Transient, that is, that sort of *Invocation*, which through the Mediation and Merits of the Saints is directed and referred to God, and in him is ultimately terminated, is neither Idolatrous, nor Superstitious, nor Unlawful, but Profitable, Laudable, and most Acceptable both to God and his Saints. Now therefore whatever out of the Holy Scriptures, the Councils, or the Fathers, is by us produced, for the Invocation of God alone, they will have it so understood, as only relating to the former kind of Invocation, as that which is due to God alone.

We therefore tell them, that this Distinction touching Invocation, is frivolous, modern, and in very deed no Distinction at all; by reason there is neither Precept nor Example for it to be met with either in the Scriptures of the Old or New Testament, nor in the Practice of the more Pure and Primitive Church, nor lastly even in those very Fathers, which, you say, are by the *Romanists* themselves alledged in this Argument; but it is really and truly a

mere

mere Invention framed on purpoſe to apologize for this preſent modern Practice of worſhipping Saints and Angels. Which very Worſhip of Saints and Angels is the ſelf ſame thing with that Worſhip of Heroes and Demons amongſt the *Gentiles*, only dreſſed up in other Expreſſions, and from the Heathen Philoſophy introduced by degrees into the Chriſtian Church, with a *non obſtante* to that moſt expreſs Forewarning of the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, throughout the whole Second Chapter of his Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, that the Chriſtians might have a particular Regard to themſelves, in Reference to that piece of Heathen Philoſophy. For as you your ſelf (moſt Learned *Vlitius*) perfectly well underſtand, the Heathen Philoſophers no leſs than the Chriſtians did acknowledge one Supreme God, to whom a ſupreme and ſovereign Adoration was to be paid, and whom they ſtiled the *Univerſal Framer* or *Diſpoſer of all things*. But then betwixt that only Supreme God and Men, they were of Opinion, that there were certain other intermediate Deities, or Gods of a lower Rank and Order, which by one common Appellation they ſtiled Demons, or by a more peculiar and diſtinct Title they called *Houſhold Gods*, Gods of Families, and Gods either of particular Nations or Cities, or Guardian Tutelary Gods of Men. Now as to ſome of theſe Demons, they were of Opinion, that they had never been circumſcribed within any humane Body, (and theſe are thoſe kind of Beings which we call Angels.) Others of them, whom they ſtiled *Heroes*, they imagined to be the Souls ſeparated from the Bodies of Perſons of the greateſt Worth and Excellency, and ſuch, as while they lived, were mighty Benefactors to Mankind in general, ſuch as amongſt us Chriſtians are eſteemed *Saints*, and ſuch as in the Church of *Rome* are not only accounted *Saints*, but, according to their own Idiom, are ſtiled *Divi*, or Men *Canoniz'd*. Now as the Heathens taught, that theſe Demons of both ſorts were by their Frame and Compoſition a middle ſort of Beings, ſo in like manner, by their Office or Employment, they were Mediators betwixt the Supreme God and Men, namely, by whoſe Mediation and Procurement, Men appeaſed their enraged God, and from God thus reconciled obtained whatever was neceſſary to compleat their Felicity. And upon this account they thought it requiſite that theſe Demons ſhould be adored by Men, not indeed as the Supreme God, but only as Sollicitors, Advocates, and Patrons to the Sovereign Deity, in Behalf of Mankind; and the Worſhip, which upon this Score was paid them, was to *invocate* them, to adore them in their Images, to dedicate Tem-

ples

ples and Altars to them, in times of Sickneſs and Danger, to make their ſolemn Vows to them, to conſecrate their Offerings, and hang up their Votive Tables at their Shrines, in grateful Memory of their paſt Dangers, and laſtly, to go on Pilgrimages to ſuch Places, which were conſecrated to them, and which, as they ſuppoſed, were moſt in their Regard.

And I make it my Requeſt (my Dear *Ulitius*) that you would conſider, whether all theſe things are not upon the ſelf ſame Account, even now practiſed by Chriſtians (drawn into this Error by the ſame Device) in Honour (as 'tis given out) of the Angels and Saints, but in Reality to the Reproach of God and Chriſt? For ſo that old crafty Deceiver did heretofore impoſe upon the Philoſophers who were the Divines of the *Gentiles*, under the ſpecious Pretence of a more profound Reverence towards the ſupreme Deity; ſuggeſting to them, that it was an unadviſed and preſumptuous Undertaking for any Mortal to make his immediate Approaches to ſo exalted and tremendous a Majeſty, and thereupon, none were to preſume to draw near to that ſupreme God, otherwiſe than by ſuch Mediators, as he himſelf ſhould aſſign, namely, by Demons; and whatever good things were either already received, or hereafter expected from God, were to be imputed to the good Offices of theſe Demons. Whence it came to paſs, that the Old Serpent by Degrees, imperceptibly, and without Struggle, drew away Mankind in every Region, not only from the Adoration, but even from the very Knowledge of the Supreme God; and at the long run brought them over to pay their Adoration to theſe Demons, that is, to himſelf under the Appellation of theſe Demons. For ſo does our very Nature incline us, that we moſt eſpecially pay our Regard and Adoration to thoſe, by whoſe good Offices we either really do, or however ſuppoſe we have received ſome Benefaction, rather than to the Party himſelf who beſtows it. But theſe were the Works of Darkneſs, in the times of Ignorance. But after that the Sun of our Righteouſneſs aroſe, then thoſe dark Shadows concerning Demons vaniſhed, and that one Supreme God, by the Generality of Mankind, begun both to be underſtood more perfectly, and more Religiouſly to be adored, than at any time heretofore, Chriſt, he who is himſelf both God and Man, being manifeſted to be the one only Mediator between God and Man; then did that Old Deceiver lay aſide for a ſeaſon his Serpentine Cunning, and aſſume the Lion, and having converted his Wiles into Fury, inſtigated ſuch who ſtill

adhered

adhered to that Demon-Worship with Fire and Sword, to persecute the faithful Servants of that one God, and one only Mediator, that he might quite destroy all such, who would no longer have him to rule over them. But when in Process of time this did not succeed to his Wishes, but he perceived that the Blood of the Martyrs proved the Seed of the Church, he then again betook himself to his old deceitful Practices: And considering with himself that in such Places where the Relicks of the Martyrs were deposited, both Prayers were made, and Oratories erected, and now and then God was also pleased to shew Miracles from that very Blood of Martyrs, which had been the Seed of the Church, he projected to gain to himself and his Synagogue a Seed-time even in the very Church of God, which he hoped would turn to account. Whereupon, that he might with more Facility impose upon the innocent Simplicity of Pious Souls, he first obtained to have it believed, that Prayers made at the *Memoriæ* of Martyrs were more acceptable with God, than in case they had been presented to him from any other Place; afterwards, when some Petitions of Moment, and such as even exceeded the Hopes of the Petitioners themselves, were in those Places obtained, that Grand Enemy of Mankind so far likewise prevail'd, as to have this not absolutely imputed to God alone, but in some measure to the Martyr, or however to that Prevalency which his Interest and Merits had with God. And to the end that this Opinion might make the deeper Impression on Mens Minds, whether by delusive Miracles of his own framing, manifested in those Places, or by real ones effected by God for some other end, but by him perverted, he so much encouraged and improved that Propensity to Superstition, which is implanted in Humane Nature, that those very Persons who at the first were wont to Invoke God alone at the Anniversaries of the Martyrs, at length made their Petitions to the Martyrs themselves, as being persuaded that nothing was to be obtained of God without their Concurrence and Intercession. Now because all Confessors are, however in Wish and Desire, Martyrs, and all Christians truly pious are, either actually, or in their Wishes, Confessors, therefore all such who are departed this Life, and have obtained of the Church to be be Canoniz'd Saints, are reputed as Martyrs, and then the Condition of the Angels, is much more to be esteemed; whereupon the Invocation both of Angels, and of All Saints, at length obtained, and became accustomary. And after this sort that ancient Demon-Worship of both kinds, practised by the *Gentiles*, under more specious Appellations,

(namely,

(namely, of Angels and Saints) tho' upon the very same Pretence of Humility, is again restored, and entertained by Christians, or indeed, rather obtruded upon Christians by the Power of Antichrist.

And so much the more inexcusably is this Practice revived, because the *Gentiles* out of a just Reverence not daring to address themselves to the Supreme God without a Mediator, and having no such Mediator of God's own Appointment, to transact between God and themselves, made use of such Mediators, as out of their own Reasonings they could frame to themselves. But Christians, seeing they have such a Mediator by God's own Appointment, who is able to accomplish every thing with God, as being the Son of God; and who is willing to obtain whatever he may from God upon the Account of us Mortals, as being the Son of Man; and furthermore, sits at the Right Hand of God, that as our Advocate he may make Intercession to his Father; and has commanded all to come unto him, and has promised, that whatever we shall ask the Father in his Name, he will give it us; seeing, I say, Christians have such a Mediator betwixt God and themselves, by God's own Designation, supposing it lawful, yet were it egregious Folly to substitute another, because none can be found more powerful with God, none more propitious to Mankind. But when Christ is not only the best, but the only Mediator betwixt God and Man, (according to St. *Paul*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator betwixt God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus*) to have any other besides him in our Thoughts, is not only foolish, but impious. For besides him to desire any other, is to reject him; nay, so far as in us lies, we dethrone Christ, and seat another which is not God at the Right Hand of God, that is, advance him to the highest Pitch of the Divine Majesty; which thing, (as before I said) is not only foolish and audacious, but manifestly impious and idolatrous. Whereupon, this sort of Angel and Saint-Worship is by much less excusable in Christians, than for Heathens to adore their Demons.

For when we are told by the *Romanists*, that there is indeed but one Mediator of Redemption, tho' there be many of Intercession, beside that they again distinguish where the Scripture does not, 'tis altogether false, that there either are or can be more Mediators of Intercession between God and Man. For to make Intercession (as you who are a most accomplish'd *Civilian* perfectly well understand) is a Term of Law, and does not barely import to Entreat, Petition, or with Importunities to beseech, but in right of his Profession and Au-

thority to plead with another, and to interpoſe himſelf, and lay out his whole Authority, toward the accompliſhing the Matter by him undertaken. And indeed in this ſort it is that Chriſt intercedes with his Father on our Behalfs, not by Noiſe and Clamour, but by interpoſing himſelf and his Merits betwixt his Father's Juſtice and the Sins of us his Brethren, which, as it were by his own Authority and Power, he withholds and reſtrains, leſt we ſhould be proceeded againſt with Severity, and the utmoſt Rigor of the Law. So that he who was the Mediator of our Redemption, even the very ſame is, and beſides himſelf neither is there, nor can there be any other Mediator of Interceſſion. And hence it is that St. *Paul* expreſly ſays, *Becauſe Chriſt humbled himſelf even unto the Death of the Croſs*, (whilſt he diſcharged the Office of the Mediator of Redemption) therefore *God hath exalted him that he might ſit at his Right Hand*, and there act as Mediator of Interceſſion; ſo that his Exaltation is, as it were, the Recompence and Reward of his Humiliation, and on that account, ſo appropriated to Chriſt, who is both God and Man, and after ſuch a peculiar manner, that it neither ought, nor indeed can be communicated to any other Creature, without the greateſt Sacrilege, and moſt manifeſt Idolatry.

Now in caſe they ſhould tell us, they do not make uſe of the Interceſſion of Saints and Angels to God in Chriſt's ſtead, but only to Chriſt in Behalf of themſelves: In the firſt Place, what need is there of another Interceſſor to the Interceſſor himſelf, and that too of an Interceſſor leſs powerful and benevolent, to one more powerful and gracious? But again, what they thus alledge is not true; for they make uſe of theſe Interceſſors with God, either in Chriſt's ſtead, or elſe together with Chriſt; nay, they beſeech the Saints, that, after the very ſame manner that Chriſt does, they would intercede with God, that is, by virtue of their Merits, or by the Repreſentation and Interpoſition of their Merits, upon the account whereof God would alſo beſtow on them the Forgiveneſs of their Sins; as is manifeſt by the Publick Forms of Worſhip in uſe amongſt them; nay, according to the common received Practice of the Church of *Rome*, 'tis cuſtomary with them, with more Frequency, and a greater Reliſh, to Invocate ſome Angel or Saint, or the Bleſſed Virgin, than Chriſt himſelf, that they would intercede with God on their Behalf: Although they cannot with any good Aſſurance Invocate any one either of the Angels or Saints, but at the ſame time they muſt acknowledge that Angel or Saint to be a Searcher of the Heart; (which is an Attribute in Scriptures

tures appropriated to God alone) and further, in him, as in God himſelf, ought they to believe. For (as the Apoſtle tells us) *how ſhall they call upon him, on whom they have not believed?* Unto which Place of the Apoſtle, Cardinal *Peron*, one of the moſt ingenious Perſons amongſt the *Romaniſts*, has nothing to return in Anſwer, but by framing ſuch a Diſtinction with Reference to Faith, as he had formerly coined concerning *Invocation*; *For*, ſays he, *it may be granted, that in ſome Senſe, and after a certain Analogy and Proportion, we do believe in the Saints.* So that they invent not only an Invocation, but a Faith alſo, that is Supreme and Subaltern, Direct and Indirect, Abſolute and Relative; laſtly, Terminative and Tranſient; which moſt certainly is a Conſideration and Diſtinction temerarious and unheard-of, utterly unknown, as well to the Fathers, as Scriptures. For according to *Peron*, who thus diſtinguiſheth, it is not only lawful to Believe Men, but to Believe in Men. But to Believe in any one, is wholly and abſolutely to depend on him, to rely upon him, and place all our Hope and Confidence in him, and in very deed to account of him no leſs than our God. For in no other Senſe is the covetous Perſon ſaid by St. *Paul* to be an Idolater, than becauſe he *Believes in his Mammon.* Whereupon, ſeeing, according to *Peron*'s own Acknowledgement, ſuch alſo who Invocate Angels and Saints, cannot Invocate them, unleſs they alſo believe in them, they are deſervedly by us reputed as Idolators. For 'tis not for us, who worſhip a Jealous God, to dare to play at faſt and looſe with him, or indeed rather to ridicule and make a mock of him by ſuch trifling Diſtinctions.

Anſwer to K. James, p. 1047.

But how was it otherwiſe poſſible for *Peron* to extricate himſelf? He perceived that Place of St. *Paul* did ſo clearly, ſo demonſtratively, and ſo beyond all Contradiction, make for the Invocation of God alone, while he denies it poſſible that any thing, in any Senſe, ſhould be the Object of our Invocation, which is not the Object of our Faith, that no ſtarting Hole being left him, whereby he might eſcape, he forc'd himſelf a Paſſage. For allowing the Apoſtle's Argument, namely, (that he alone is to be Invocated by us, on whom we are to Believe) the Aſſumption or Inference implied in that Argument, (to wit, but we are to believe in God alone) he confidently denies, affirming, that we are not to believe in God alone, but alſo in Angels, and in Saints; ſo that he rather choſe to contradict the Apoſtle, and the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in the Apoſtle, than not accord with, or rather indeed flatter, the Spirit of Lies,

belching out Blasphemies in the Church of *Rome*; for, as afterwards will appear, it was not so much his own, as the Opinion of that Church to which he adhered, which in this Place he maintains. And most assuredly he was a Person so every way great, blessed likewise with so profound and penetrating a Judgment, and so throughly furnish'd with all the Advantages of Learning, that what *Virgil* says concerning *Hector*, may (necessary Alterations being allow'd) be applied to *Peron*, which thing was formerly remarked by the most Learned, most Ingenious, and my most particular Friend the Right Honourable Lord *Falkland*,

——— Si Pergama Dextra
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.
If by a Mortal Pen the Papal *Throne*
Could be maintain'd, 'twas by Peron's *alone.*

And yet notwithstanding all the Arguments which either by him, or any other Advocates of the Church of *Rome*, are in this Cause for the *Invocation of Saints* alledged, they will have them so to be understood, as only to be conclusive, with reference to that kind of Invocation which is Subaltern, Indirect, Relative, and Transient; namely, for such an Invocation, wherein something is petitioned of God through their Mediation, and not such an Invocation, wherein something is requested of them to be granted to us, or by them to be done for us. For such an Invocation, *Peron* confesseth, in case it be addressed to any created Being, is Idolatrous. But such, say I, is the *Invocation of Saints* in the Church of *Rome*; and that too not only as 'tis practised amongst the ordinary sort, but in the Publick Forms of Prayer, prescribed and publickly used by the Church; as will easily appear to any one who shall look into the *Romish Breviarie*, *Hours of Prayer*, and *Psalter of the Blessed Virgin*, and *Litanies of the Saints*. But I will not rake in that Dung-hill; but shall only transcribe one short Prayer to the Blessed Virgin, and as your beloved *Virgil* says, *——— Grimine ab uno disce omnes.* By one short Prayer guess how the rest are framed.

O Maria gratiosa,	Hail sweetest *Mary*, full of Grace,
Dulcis Mitis & Formosa,	Meek, and of a Beauteous Face,
Applica nobis Gratiam.	Make Grace on us descend.
O Maria gloriosa,	Hail *Mary*, crown'd with Glory bright,
In deliciis deliciosa,	Prepare for us, our chief Delight,
Prapara nobis Gloriam.	Glory that has no end.

Reparatrix

Reparatrix & Salvatrix,	Thou who restor'st and say'st the Soul,
Desperantis animæ,	When black Despair takes place,
Irroratrix & Largitrix	And water'st with, and on it shed'st
Spiritualis gratiæ;	The Dews of Heavenly Grace,
Quod requiro, quod respiro,	What I with Earnestness request,
Mea sana vulnera,	My Wounds some Balm allow,
Et da menti te poscenti,	And on my Soul which hangs on thee,
Gratiarum munera.	The Gifts of Grace bestow.

Behold here a Form of Prayers (in case ever any was or can possibly be so) Direct, Absolute, and Determinative to the Blessed Virgin her self. And lest this Form of *Invocating the Saints*, practised and allowed of in the Church of *Rome* should not become notorious to all Persons, it is not only printed in their Books, but painted on their Church-Doors, and engraven on the Walls of their publick Edifices; as at *Brussels*, where on the Front of the publick Edifices belonging to the City, this Prayer of the Inhabitants to the Virgin *Mary*, as to the Tutelary Goddess of the City, is exposed to publick View, being cut in Capital Letters, so as it may be read by all who pass by.

A BELLO, PESTE, ET FAME, LIBERA NOS MARIA.
From War, Pestilence, and Famine, O Mary, deliver us.

Which being it is with them the common Form of Invocating the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints, certainly either this is Idolatry, or there never was any such thing; and such Idolatry, as *Peron* himself neither dares defend, nor does he endeavour to justify it, by any Quotations from the Fathers. Wherefore supposing, but not granting, that other kind of *Invocating the Saints*, namely, (what they call) Indirect and Relative, had obtain'd in the Ancient and Primitive Church, yet from thence can no Argument be drawn, either to maintain or apologize for the present Practice of the Church of *Rome*. But neither was there even so much as this, nor any other Invocation at all in the Ancient Church, saving of God alone. Neither have the Ancients been acquainted with this *Romish* Distinction of Invocation (as *Peron* terms it) Direct and Indirect, Absolute and Relative, and of Supreme and Subaltern, but speaking always concerning Invocation, after one and the self same manner, without all Curiosity, do upon all Occasions ascribe it to God alone, as the peculiar and incommunicable Worship of God. And hence it is that *Athanasius*, and others of the Orthodox Ancients,

disputing

disputing against the *Arians*, from Christ's being Invocated, conclude him to be God; the Force of which Argument, the *Arians* might with the greatest Facility have repressed, by telling them, in case any such Distinction concerning Invocation, had in those Days been understood that it was possible that some Person who was not God might be Invocated, (namely, with that sort of Invocation which was Subaltern, and Indirect, Relative, though not with that which was Supreme, Direct, and Absolute.)

Moreover, in these Dogmatical and Doctrinal Tracts of the Ancients, which *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Nyssene*, *Augustine*, and others, have written concerning *Invocation*, on set purpose, and with that peculiar design, to instruct others how they ought to pray, there is not any such sort of Distinction; nor, as *Peron* himself confesseth, p. 1042. any though even but the very least Intimation given of any *Invocation of the Saints*; and all this, notwithstanding, the same *Peron* tells us, p. 1043. that from such Tracts most especially are we to make a Judgment, what is the undoubted and genuine Opinion of the Ancient Fathers concerning any particular Doctrine. Lastly, in case the Fathers had acknowledged and approved of this Subaltern and Relative *Invocation of the Saints*, when *Celsus*, *Julian*, and *Faustus Manichæus* made it their Objection, That the *Christians* paid the same Adoration to their Martyrs, which the *Gentiles* offered to their Heroes, *Origen*, *Cyril*, and *Augustine* would not barely have denied what was thus objected, but would have answered that betwixt the *Christian* Martyrs and the *Gentile* Heroes there was a wide Difference; and though to invocate the former of these was allowable, yet was it abominable in case even this Subaltern Invocation were offered to the latter; for even the *Gentiles* themselves were of Opinion, that Supreme Adoration was not to be paid to any other but to the Supreme Deity; wherefore, in case the *Christians* by this Subaltern Invocation had paid to their Martyrs a Subaltern Worship, most assuredly they had worshipped their Martyrs after the self same manner that the *Gentiles* did their Heroes.

But 'tis worth our while here to consider how *Peron* goes about the untying this Knot; "For, says he, the Fathers do not always speak "what is agreeable to their Opinions, but conceal them, only pro- "ducing such Arguments as best make for the Cause they have un- "der Consideration, and may suffice to defend the same against the "Objections of the *Gentiles*. And a little after this, pag. 1044. "The Fathers, says he, as much as in them lies, and so far as pos- "sibly

" ſibly they may, avoid and decline all Occaſions of delivering their
" Thoughts concerning the *Invocation of Saints*, which was then pra-
" ctiſed in the Church; being apprehenſive leſt to the *Gentiles* there
" might appear ſomething as it were of Agreeableneſs (tho' indeed
" but counterfeit and equivocal) betwixt that Worſhip paid by the
" Church to the Saints, and that which the Heathens offered to their
" imaginary Deities; and leſt the Heathens ſhould thence take oc-
" caſion, where indeed none was given them, to retort upon them
" (that is, upon the Fathers) that Practice of the Church, namely,
" of *Invocating the Saints*. But is not this a Confeſſion ſufficiently plain, that there is not in the Writings of the Ancient Fathers any Teſtimony to be met with of ſufficient Authority to countenance this Practice of the Church? And ſeeing thus it is, whence I pray can it be made appear to us, or even to *Peron* himſelf, that any ſuch Cuſtom had in thoſe Days obtained in the Church? Is it poſſible that we ſhould have any other Indication concerning what were the Opinions and Practices of the Ancient Church, beſides what we have from the Writings of the Ancients? Beſides this, is it not from hence manifeſt, that the *Romaniſts* (whatever to the contrary they vainly boaſt) have leſs honourable Conceptions concerning the Fathers and the Ancient Church than we? For whenever was there any one of us, who either by Word or Writing, ſaid, that the Fathers to ſerve a preſent turn did either craftily conceal what they knew to be true, or otherwiſe aſſerted ſuch things to be true, which they believed were more advantageous, or however leſs prejudicial to the Cauſe they maintained? Or which of us have ever entertained ſuch abject Thoughts concerning the Church of Chriſt, or the Chriſtian Faith, as to believe it neceſſary to conceal or diſguiſe any one Practice of the Church, or Article of our Faith, out of any dread of the *Heathens*, or leſt our Religion might by the *Gentiles* be accounted a diſhoneſt thing, and ſo become a Matter of Reproach to us? God forbid we ſhould at this rate be aſhamed of the Goſpel, whereof neither St. *Paul*, nor any of the Orthodox Fathers, were at any time aſhamed; who, in caſe they had been apprehenſive of any thing from the *Gentiles*, in reference to themſelves, or the Chriſtian Doctrine, namely, leſt the Goſpel ſhould with them fall under any Obloquy, would moſt certainly with equal Concern have concealed their Belief concerning the Holy Trinity, as that of the *Invocation of Saints*, leſt the one might be falſly charged with the ſame Polytheiſm, as the other with the ſame Demon-Worſhip which was practiſed amongſt

the

the *Gentiles*. Wherefore, seeing they always, whenever occasion offered, made publick Profession of the one, but never once mentioned the other; nay farther, seeing upon all Occasions they gloried in the one, but when at any time the other was objected to them they flatly and constantly denied it; we must needs conceive, that out of a too blind Affection towards his Mother the Church of *Rome*, *Peron* was misled, when, lest he should not cover her Nakedness, he was not ashamed to brand the Ancient Fathers, and Catholick Church, with such a Mark of Infamy.

And really, in my Opinion, so has *Peron* in this Matter behaved himself, that he would rather have it believed, that the Ancient Church accorded with the *Gentiles*, than that the Church of *Rome* differed from it. For it can no way be denied, but that such is now the Worship of Angels and Saints in the Church of *Rome*, as was formerly that of Demons and Heroes amongst the *Heathens*. Which very thing also, St. *Paul* both foresaw and foretold would sometime so fall out; when 1 *Tim.* chap. 4. he expressly tells us, *That in the latter times these Doctrines of Devils*, (that is) these Doctrines concerning the Worship of Demons, together with those others of *forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from Meats*, would steal into the Church. And certainly (as is manifest from the Order of the times, most accurately calculated by that most Learned Divine *Joseph Mede* our Country-man) these three, *The Invocation of Saints*, *The Order for the Celibacy of the Clergy, and the Prohibition of some certain kinds of Meats*, by the same Authors, (namely, by the Monks promoted to Bishopricks) and near about the same time, (to wit, about the midle, or towards the Conclusion of the fourth Century, and so downwards) begun to be publickly introduc'd into the Church. For as *Chemnitius* tells, p. 632. in his Examination of the Council of *Trent*, about the Year of our Lord 370. *Invocation of Saints* begun to be introduced into the Publick Assemblies of the Church by St. *Basil*, *Nyssene*, and *Nazianzen*, in their Panegyrical Orations; though others of our Party say, as even *Chemnitius* himself afterwards does, that these great Persons did not so much themselves introduce them, as give occasion to others to do it; who, from their Apostrophies, Prosopopœas, and other such like Rhetorical and Figurative Expressions made use of in their Panegyricks, took occasion dogmatically, and in good earnest, to deliver these Doctrines; although these very Panegyrists, (I mean *Nazianzen*, and the rest) when at any time they indulged themselves in these Rhetorical Flourishes, for the

the moſt they were their own Correctors, leſt in any thing contrary to their Intentions they might impoſe upon their Auditories. Such may we account theſe Expreſſions of *Nazianzen*, (when he reaſons concerning the Saints interceding for us) *as I ſuppoſe, in my Opinion, if theſe Expreſſions be not too daring, in caſe they have any Perception*, and ſuch like. Now thoſe Authors who thus expreſs themſelves, in reference to theſe Matters, concerning which they deliver themſelves with ſuch Caution and Diffidence, 'tis apparent that even they themſelves have not abſolute Confidence and full Aſſurance. And yet out of theſe ſo inconſiderable Beginnings, and upon theſe ſo ſandy and unſtable Foundations is raiſed that whole Structure of the Worſhip of Saints, Angels, and Images, which now amongſt Chriſtians we behold ſo ſplendidly, and with ſuch Pomp, and even beyond the very *Heathens* Theatrically adorned; ſucceeding Ages always adding ſomething of their own over and above what the Superſtition of their Anceſtors had deviſed, till by purſuing theſe byways they have at length arrived at that infamous Apoſtacy, which the Apoſtle, 2 *Theſſ.* ch. 2 foretold ſhould one Day prevail in the Chriſtian Church; I ſay Apoſtacy in, not from the Church, becauſe the Apoſtle (as will be plain by comparing that Place to the *Theſſ.* with that of 1 *Tim.* ch. 4.) does intend not an abſolute and bare-fac'd Renunciation of Chriſt, and the Chriſtian Faith, but a ſly treacherous Defection from the true Worſhip of the one God, and one Mediator, under a counterfeit Diſguiſe of Humility and Devotion; whilſt that Honour which is only due to the Supreme God, and his Chriſt, is either entirely transferred upon Chriſtian Demons and Heroes, that is, upon Angels and Saints, or however they are made to participate of it. And this is that Spiritual Fornication which the Holy Scriptures point out as the moſt notorious Badge whereby to know the *Whore of Babylon*; for notwithſtanding ſhe may acknowledge Chriſt for her Husband, yet foraſmuch as ſhe proſtitutes her ſelf to others, ſhe is an Adultereſs: Nay, though ſhe had proſtituted her ſelf to others, yet had ſhe not been an Adultereſs, in caſe ſhe had not acknowledged Chriſt for her Husband; for an Adultereſs ſhe is not, unleſs ſhe be both Wife and Whore, or ſuch a Whore as hath an Husband: And upon this ſelf ſame ſcore do the Prophets ſo frequently and ſo ſeverely accuſe the Ancient Church of *Iſrael* of Adultery; not becauſe they did not all worſhip the true God, but becauſe they adored others beſides, or together with him.

Neither is that of any weight which by ſome has been anſwered, namely, that both *Jews* and *Gentiles* offered Sacrifices to others beſides God, but that They do only *Invocate* the Saints and Angels; and that Sacrifice is in very deed a part of Worſhip, which is due to God alone, but ſo is not *Invocation*. For in the firſt Place, this Anſwer begs the Queſtion, being it aſſumes that as granted, which ought to be proved, namely, that *Invocation*, and ſuch eſpecially as with them is practiſed with Relation to their *Saints*, is not a Worſhip which is due to God alone. Again, to whom the *Jews* and *Gentiles* offered Sacrifices, the very ſame and them alone did they *Invocate*: and therefore they no leſs offended by paying their *Invocation*, than by offering their Sacrifices, where they were not due. Laſtly, ſeeing all Sacrifices properly ſo called had their Conſummation, and conſequently their Finiſhing and Abolition in that only, once offered, always to be commemorated, and never to be repeated Sacrifice of the Croſs, there remain now under the New Covenant, no other Sacrifices to be offered by Chriſtians, but what are Spiritual; of which ſort moſt eſpecially are Prayers and Supplications, and upon that account are they ſtiled in Scripture *the Calves of our Lips*, and *the Offering of Incenſe*, and are compared to the *Morning and Evening Sacrifices*. Yea, and according to the Language of the Ancient Church, to Sacrifice and to Supplicate are ſynonomous Terms, and made uſe of to ſignify the ſame thing. For (ſays *Tertullian* in his Apologetick) *We ſacrifice with holy Prayer for the Emperor's Welfare, but only to the one true God*; where, as he terms Prayer a Sacrifice, ſo in like manner does he affirm, that according to the Practice of the Church in that Age wherein he lived, it was not cuſtomary that it ſhould be offered to Saints and Angels, but to the one true God; for in that Place *Tertullian* ſpeaks not by the by, but on ſet purpoſe concerning the Publick and commonly received Forms of Prayer, and ſuch as were uſed by the Univerſal Church. Wherefore, ſeeing *Invocation* is a Spiritual Sacrifice, and under the Goſpel there are no other Sacrifices, ſeeing likewiſe, that all Sacrifices, as well Evangelical as Legal, are to be offered to God alone, aſſuredly ſuch who now under the Goſpel do not *Invocate* God alone, no leſs than thoſe who under the Law did not Sacrifice to God alone, are to be Regiſtred amongſt Idolaters.

And in very deed, were they by the Ancient Church eſteemed as Idolaters: for the Synod of *Laodicea*, (which the *Romaniſts* reckon was celebrated before that of *Nice*) in the 35th Canon, condemn thoſe

those *who Invocated Angels, as guilty of secret Idolatry.* For (say the Fathers in that Synod) *If there be any found practising this secret kind of Idolatry, let him be Anathema, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and hath gone over to Idolatry.* And that this is the very Sense of this Canon, *Theodoret* (who was near upon Cotemporary with St. *Augustine*, was St. *Chrysostom*'s Scholar, and flourished in the beginning of the Fifth Century) does most evidently testify in his Commentaries on that famous Text of St. *Paul*, Col. ch. 2. v. 18. *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in a voluntary Humility, and worshipping of Angels, &c.* where he has these Words very well worthy our particular Remark, *Those who maintained the Law, engaged them also to worship Angels. Now this corrupt Disposition for a long time continued in* Phrygia *and* Pisidia; *upon which account the Synod convened in* Laodicea, *a City of* Phrygia, *by a Canon prohibited the Invocation of Angels.* From whence it is plain, that to Invocate Angels in the Canon, and to Pray to Angels in *Theodoret*, is one and the very same Angel-Worship, which St. *Paul* admonisheth to be aware of, and the *Laodicean* Synod condemns as secret Idolatry.

Nor can it possibly be doubted, but that the Worshippers of Saints (in case any such had in those Days appeared in the Church) had been censured with the same *Anathema*; for in case it be not lawful that Angels, much less is it so that Saints, or the departed Souls of the most pious Persons, should be Invocated: The Reason is, Because none ever yet have doubted, but that Angels do always behold the Face of God; but whether or no the Souls of the Saints either at present do, or before the Consummation of all things shall enjoy the like Privilege, many of the most ancient Doctors of the Church have not only doubted, but have affirmed they shall not; amongst whom, (as I have before said) *Irenæus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Lactantius*, with many others, are reckoned up by *Sixtus Senensis*, in the 6th Book of his *Biblioth. Sanct.* Whereupon, out of the Writings of any of these Fathers cannot any sufficient Evidence be produced for the *Invocation of Saints.* For seeing the very Foundation upon which the *Invocation of Saints* is bottomed, is their Intuition, or beholding the Face of God in Heaven, how is it possible that they who deny the Saints to be in Heaven, should affirm that they are to be Invocated? Wherefore, in case any thing of this Nature be to be met with, in any of the Works of any one of these Fathers, of Necessity we must allow either that Book to be counterfeit, or that Passage corrupted, or lastly the Author (whoever he be) not to be consistent with himself. And farther, even from

hence it is evident, that the *Invocation of Saints* in the Ages wherein these Fathers lived, was neither received into the Faith nor Practice of the Church, seeing it is altogether incredible, that Persons of such Note and Eminence, and the very Prime Doctors of the Church, should ever be of an Opinion so foreign, nay so downright contradictory to the Faith and Practice of the Church, or in case they had, should dare to publish it.

Notwithstanding all this, the *Romanists*, such is their Assurance, greedily catch at any thing which may but seem to countenance this their Hypothesis, and can any way be wrested either to defend or excuse the *Invocation of Saints*, not only from some of the Works of these same Fathers, but, what is more to be wonder'd at, from the very Books of the *Old Testament* it self; tho' the *Romanists* do themselves affirm, that even till Christ descended into Hell, the Souls of all the Ancient Saints were excluded Heaven, and detained in I know not what *Limbo*, (where they were altogether ignorant of what was transacted here on Earth.) Therefore, with what either Integrity to God-ward, or becoming Regard towards Men, or Consistency and Accordance with themselves, they can produce any Authorities of this Nature, let them look to it.

The Testimonies of the Fathers considered.

In the mean time, that those who maintain the *Invocation of Saints* should (as you, most Learned *Ulitius*, tell us) confidently alledge, not only S. *Chrysostom*, *Jerom*, and other Authors of the Fourth Century, but even St. *Augustine* himself is no way strange; seeing *Bellarmine* does not only produce the Testimonies of these and other Fathers of the Fourth Age, but even *Irenæus* himself, and *Dionysius*, (as by him he is called) the *Areopagite*, more ancient, as the *Romanists* will have it, than *Irenæus*, and coetaneous with the Apostles, with equal Assurance.

Of Dionysius.

And on God's Name let him enjoy this his *Dionysius*, but not the *Areopagite*, who in very deed was coetaneous with the Apostles, as being by St. *Paul* converted to the Faith; but that this *Dionysius* alledged by *Bellarmine*, to wit, the Author of those Books of the *Cœlestial Hierarchy*, *Mystical Theology*, *&c.* was not that Primitive *Areopagite*, is plain from *Eusebius*, and St. *Jerom*, who make no mention of this *Dionysius*, nor of any such Books, tho' with the greatest Accuracy they composed Catalogues of all those Ancient Authors, which writ before, and were extant in their Ages. Nay farther, this counterfeit *Dionysius* quotes *Clemens* the Philosopher, (namely, *Clemens* of *Alexandria*) who lived in the beginning of the Third Century; he also treats of Churches, of Altars, of the Quire,

Quire, of placing the Catechumens without the Doors of the Church, and concerning many other such like Matters, which were not in being while the *Areopagite* was alive; yea, and he mentions Monks; and the very *Romanists* themselves confess, that *Paul* and *Anthony* were the first of that Order, who lived after the Third Century was compleated. From all which it is abundantly evident, that this *Dionysius* was not the *Areopagite*; and further, that (whoever he were) he lived after *Eusebius*, and St. *Jerom*, and consequently after the Conclusion of the Fourth Century. Upon which Considerations, even by the *Romanists* themselves, namely, by *Laurentius Valla*, *Erasmus*, and *Grocinus*, this *Dionysius* is ranged amongst Apocryphal Authors.

Erasmus's *Annot.* on Act. 17. 34.

As for what relates to *Ireneus*, he indeed flourished in the Second Century after Christ; but it is worth our while to consider, what *Bellarmine* with all his Toil has drawn out of him for the *Invocation of Saints*; to wit, "That like as *Eve* was se-"duced that she might fly from God, so *Mary* was perswaded to o-"bey God, that the Virgin *Mary* might become the Advocate of "the Virgin *Eve*; to which Words of *Ireneus*, *Bellarmine* subjoins, "What more evident? Yea rather, What more obscure? For how was it possible for *Mary*, after her Decease, to be an Advocate for *Eve*, while she was alive, seeing *Eve* was dead so many thousand Years before *Mary* was born? Again, supposing *Mary* to have been *Eve*'s Advocate, because *Mary* brought forth that Blessed Seed of the Woman, which was first promised to *Eve*; who is there will allow *Bellarmine*, that *Eve* ought therefore to Invocate *Mary*? For the Saints interceding for us, is no ground for us to pray to them. Moreover, *Ireneus* was one of those Fathers who did not suppose the Saints were as yet received into Heaven, and therefore never entertained any such Thoughts, as that any of the Saints did intercede for us, and much less that they were to be Invocated by us. Lastly, *Ireneus* describing his own Form of Prayer, Book 3. against Heresies, ch. 6. "I, says he, invoke thee, O Lord, the God of *Abra-*"*ham*, the God of *Isaac*, the God of *Jacob*, the Father of our Lord "Jesus Christ, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord: No mention there, nor any where else by *Ireneus*, when he prays, is made of *Mary*, or of any other Saint, but as he directs his Petitions to God alone, so in like manner thro' Jesus Christ alone.

Of Ireneus.

Of Pope Cornelius.

Besides this *Ireneus* amongst the *Greeks*, and he too but in that one single obscure Place, and Pope *Cornelius*, (who was coetanous with St. *Cyprian*) amongst the *Latins*

Bel-,

Bellarmine quotes not one more ancient than the Fourth Century. Now those which with him pass for the Words of Pope *Cornelius* do indeed say, "That the Apostles do intercede on our Behalf, but of our Invocating them, say nothing at all. But where these Words of *Cornelius* are to be met with, excepting in *Bellarmine*, I do not yet find. For when *Bellarmine* himself, p. 181. of his *Ecclesiastical Writers*, tells us, that only Four of *Cornelius*'s Epistles are now extant, and these too are imperfect; Two whereof are amongst St. *Cyprian*'s Epistles, as being written to him; a Third in *Eusebius*'s History, *lib. 6. ch.* 35. but the Fourth to *Lupicinus* (which he tells us is but short) is in the first Tome of the Library of the Holy Fathers; the Three former of these with Application I have perused, in none of which do I find these Words by *Bellarmine* alledged, nor any thing either in Sound or Sense like to them; so that either they are no where to be met with, or in that short Epistle to *Lupicinus*, which thing, whether it be so or otherwise, I am not able to say, because have I not that Book by me; altho' *Bellarmine* may seem not to intimate that Epistle, for he tells us, *Cornelius* has these Expressions in his first Epistle concerning the *Translation of the Bodies of the Apostles*, as tho' there were more Epistles written by him on that Subject; which thing, how it can be consistent with what in his Book of *Ecclesiastical Writers* he speaks concerning *Cornelius*'s Works, I for my own part do not perceive. But why does not *Bellarmine* quote St. *Cyprian* himself, which, as to that Particular he knew to be of the same Opinon with *Cornelius*, that the Saints departed did intercede for those who are alive? namely, because he had well considered with himself, that from St *Cyprian* it was very plain, that though the Saints departed might intercede for us, yet were they not upon that Account to be Invocated by us, but rather are they to be intreated by us while they yet continue alive amongst us, that in case they shall depart hence before us, they would be mindful of us in that other Life? For, *Book* 1. *Ep.* 1. to *Cornelius*, "We are, says St. *Cyprian*, "mutually mindful of one another on both Sides, always praying for "one another; and whethersoever of us God of his gracious Goodness shall vouchsafe to take hence before the other, let our Love "continue with God; nor let our Prayers be wanting to our Merciful Father, in Behalf of our Brethren and Sisters. But what need was there of this Premonition, or why did St. *Cyprian* judge it necessary while *Cornelius* was yet alive, by way of Anticipation to recommend himself to *Cornelius*'s Prayers after his Decease,

in

in case he had been of Opinion, either that the Dead were to be Invocated, or could hear the Prayers of those who should call upon them? Which thing seeing *Bellarmine* was well aware of, he rather chose to make use of a less apposite and less authentick Testimony of *Cornelius*, than of an Evidence more pertinent and more indubitable from St. *Cyprian*, for the Intercession of Saints.

Of the Fathers of the 4. Century.

And in very deed when the *Romanists* deal ingenuously, they confine themselves within the Limits of the Fourth, and the succeeding Ages. And even those very Authorities of the Fourth Age, on which they most of all rely, are not taken out of the Dogmatical or Doctrinal, nay nor yet from the Polemical, but the very most of them, either from the Rhetorical or from the Poetical Writings of the Fathers; namely, from the Works of St. *Basil*, *Nyssene*, and *Nazianzen*, as also from *Paulinus* and *Prudentius*; all which, tho' I esteem Pious, Learned, and in their several ways Admirable Persons, yet can I not otherwise choose but lament, that those so considerable Persons, and in every thing besides so well deserving of the Church of God, should yet give occasion to their Admirers and Followers of falling into such notorious Errors, whilst indulging too far to their Rhetorical and Poetical Genius, they in their Panegyricks and Poetical Compositions, with less Circumspection and less Propriety sometimes express themselves. The *Romanists* do indeed labour hard to draw other Persons in this Century of great Authority over to their Party in this Argument, but 'tis against the grain, and by the Head and Shoulders they do it; namely, St. *Athanasius*, *Chrysostome*, and *Cyrill*, amongst the *Greeks*; St. *Hillary*, *Ambrose*, *Jerom*, and *Augustine* also amongst the *Latins*.

Of Athanasius.

But in the first Place, that Authority out of *Athanasius*, by *Bellarmine* alledged for the *Invocation of the Blessed Virgin*, is taken out of a certain Sermon concerning the *most holy Mother of God*, or upon the *Annunciation*: But *Baronius*, in the first Tome of his *Annals*, p. 48. sect. 19, 20. does not only affirm, but prove this Sermon to be wrongfully imputed to St. *Athanasius*. Moreover, *Athanasius* (as is well known) from Christ's being Invocated, proves him to be God; but in his 3d Oration against the *Arrians*, speaking concerning the Blessed Virgin, he says, She is our Sister, and therefore a created Being; but one Creature does not pay his Worship and Adoration to his Fellow-Creature.

Of Chrysostom.

Secondly, The Place which out of St. *Chrysostom* *Bellarmine* produceth, is drawn out of the 66th Homily to the People

of

of *Antioch*: But with what Assurance can he do this? when the self same *Bellarmine* p. 162. of his *Ecclesiastical Writers*, says, "That "in the fifth Tome of St. *Chrysostom*'s Works, almost all the Tracts "are genuine and undoubted, except the Homilies to the People of "*Antioch*, amongst which there are, says he, only in the Ancient Li- "braries one and twenty Manuscripts to be met with. *Thus far* Bellarmine. These Words therefore which he transcribes as the Words of St. *Chrysostom*, are, even himself being Judge, of doubtful Authority: But by Reason they plainly make for the *Invocation of Saints*, he thought it not amiss to honour these spurious Brats with a Father of the fairest Character, that he might the better impose upon his unwary and injudicious Readers.

But perhaps he produceth out of St. *Chrysostom* other and more genuine Quotations: He makes a show indeed as if he had some such, but whether he really has or no, does not appear; for he only hints at, but does not transcribe them; which thing, without all peradventure he would have done, in case that would have stood him in any stead. But *Bellarmine* full well understood, that in those very Places, which he points us to, St. *Chrysostom* either was an Adversary to the Cause he maintains, or otherwise, said not one Word which was pertinent to the Argument.

1. For in the 5th Homily on St. *Matthew*, (which is the first of those Places he hints at) *Chrysostom* does indeed say, "That the Pray- "ers of the Saints have the greatest Efficacy. But what kind of Saints does St. *Chrysostom* there intend, whether such as are yet alive, or those departed? Certainly those who are alive, as is plain from the Context, yea, even as *Bellarmine* (in his Answer to the Arguments of his Adversaries) does himself afterwards confess: So that in this Homily, there is nothing that will any way advantage him, but something there is which makes against him; for in that which follows, "God, says St. *Chrysostom*, will rather bestow Grace upon "our selves, than on others upon our Account; that we may both "enjoy the Benefit of our Assurance, and become more perfect, "whilst we our selves labour to appease God's Wrath; after this "manner did he shew Mercy to the *Canaanitish* Woman; thus saved "he her that was taken in Adultery; in like sort the Thief; no "Mediator or Advocate interposing. It follows indeed, "And "these things do I speak, not that we should not beseech the Saints, "but that we should not despond, neither faint and become sloth- "ful, committing what concerns our selves solely to the Care of o-

thers.

" others. But here in this Place alſo, like as before, he underſtands thoſe Saints that are alive; to whoſe Prayers and Interceſſions ſome aſcribing too much, and putting too much Confidence in them, either through Slothfulneſs neglected, or elſe out of a Deſpondency through the Conſciouſneſs of their Guilts, did not dare to petition God on their own Behalf. He therefore exhorts them, that every one of them would in their own Behalf put up their Prayers to God, after the Example of the *Canaaniti∫h* Woman, of *Mary Magdalen*, and the Thief upon the Croſs, (who without the Interceſſion of any Saint prayed for themſelves, and tho' they were the greateſt amongſt Sinners, yet did God vouchſafe mercifully to hear them) yet for all this, would he not have them ſet light by the Prayers of others on their Behalf. " For though, ſays he, " God hears every one's Prayers upon their own accounts, with great- " er Complacency, than thoſe which are made by others in their Behalf, " yet, adds he, the Prayers of one in Behalf of another are not without " their Efficacy, ſo that thoſe Perſons who intercede with God for " other Perſons be themſelves pious and acceptable to God. And that this is the true Intent and Meaning of this place will readily appear to any one who ſhall conſult the Context. But however Matters are ordered, neceſſary it is that by *Saints* we muſt either underſtand the Saints who are yet alive, or otherwiſe thoſe which are in Heaven. If the former, then what is here ſaid makes not any thing either for or againſt the *Invocation of Saints* who are departed this Life: If the latter, we muſt then of Neceſſity acknowledge, that according to St. *Chry∫oſtom*, the Prayers of a Penitent Sinner on his own Behalf are more acceptable, than the Interceſſions of thoſe Saints who are themſelves in Heaven; than which what can there more be ſaid againſt the *Invocation of Saints*, or more concluſive againſt the repoſing any Confidence in their Interceſſions? And it is moſt certain, in many other Places St. *Chry∫oſtom* delivers himſelf to the very ſame Purpoſe, that he may prevail with penitent Sinners, and ſuch as upon any account ſtand in need of God's Aſſiſtance, how unworthy ſoever they may eſteem themſelves, to make their Addreſſes to Chriſt directly, and of themſelves, without all the unneceſſary Trouble of Interceſſors.

But of the many that might be produced, I ſhall only tranſcribe for you one Teſtimony, out of the Homily which concerns the Explication of what relates to the *Canaaniti∫h* Woman: For in that Place, he propoſes as an Example to all others, that Woman who made her Application neither to the Apoſtles, nor by their Procurement to their Maſter, but directly, without any Mediator, to Chriſt himſelf: " Which very Woman, ſays he, tho' ſhe were ſo very wicked, and a

" Transgressor of the Law, took Courage to come unto Christ. And " consider, I pray, the Sagacity of this Woman, she interceeds not to " St. *James*, she beseeches not St. *John*, neither does she address her " self to St. *Peter*, but passeth through the whole Company, saying, or " as tho' she had said, " I have no need of a Mediator, but laying hold " on my Repentance as my Advocate, I go directly to the Fountain it " self; for this Cause Christ came down from Heaven, for this End " did he take upon him our Flesh, that even I might apply my self to " him. In Heaven the Cherubims tremble at his Presence, and on Earth " a Woman taken in Adultery talks familiarly with him. And with an Exhortation drawn from this Example does he conclude. "Seeing there- " fore, my Beloved, that you perceive all things relating to Prayers, are " to be performed according to the Pattern of the *Canaanitish* Woman, " do you call upon the Lord himself, for he is not a Man that you should " go to some one determinate Place to seek him; God is always at " hand. If you have any thing to sue for at the Hands of Man, you " must enquire what he is a doing; Does he sleep? Is he at Leisure? The " Servant returns thee no Answer. But with God there is nothing of all " this; for whersoever you go, if you call upon him he hears; neither " does want of Leisure, nor of a Mediator, nor does any Servant deny " thee access to him. What could possibly be spoken with greater Per- spicuity, more fully, and with greater Cogency, to demonstrate that we have no need of a Mediator to Christ, nor to God besides Christ? For whereas two things are principally wont to be alledged, why we should not address our selves directly to God, but thro' the Mediation of the Saints; one whereof is in regard of our selves, namely, by rea- son we are defiled and covered with our Iniquities, and therefore are we unworthy to have any Communication with God or Christ direct- ly, and without a Mediator; the other is with respect to God, namely, because allowing it not agreeable or Court-like, that any Person here on Earth should rudely rush into the Presence of his Prince, without being introduced by some Favourite, much less is it so to present our Petitions to him in Heaven, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, without the Mediation of Saints and Angels, who are, as it were, his Courtiers and Favourites. Now St. *Chrysostom* (in those Words by me above produced) obviates both these Pretences, and so quite subverts them both, as if on set purpose he had laboured to oppose himself to this then growing Superstition, and to tear up both Root and Branch from out the Inclinations of the People.

2. But to proceed: The second Place which out of St. *Chrysostom Bel- larmine* points at, but does not produce, is said to be in the 8th Homily

on

on St. *Matthew*, but having carefully once and again read over that whole Homily, I find in it nothing at all any way relating to this Controverſy, and what has no being cannot be ſhewn.

3. The third Quotation is out of the 43d Homily on *Geneſis*, wherein I meet with juſt as much as in the former, that is juſt nothing at all. But perhaps thro' the miſtake of the Printer the 43d is put for the 44th. for in that indeed it is ſaid, "That the Miniſtry or Negotiation "of the Saints mightily contributes to our Benefit. But here again, by the Miniſtration of the Saints, he intends the Interceſſions of the Living, in behalf of thoſe who are alive, as is moſt evident from what precedes and follows the Words; for he ſpeaks concerning *Lot*'s Deliverance from the Deſtruction of *Sodom*, by virtue of *Abraham*'s Interceſſion. Beſides, in caſe this had been ſpoken concerning the Interceſſion of the Saints departed, in behalf of thoſe who were amongſt the Living, it had indeed proved that *Chryſoſtom* was of Opinion, that the Saints departed did intercede with God in our Behalf, but not that we were therefore to offer up our Prayers to them.

4. The fourth Authority is out of the 1ſt Homily on Ep. 1. to the *Theſſalonians*, where what is ſpoken touching the Benefit of thoſe Prayers, which by the Living are mutually offer'd unto God, in Behalf of themſelves and others, is again transferred to the Saints departed, as is evident from the Examples in that Place produced, to wit, the Prayers of the whole Church in St. *Peter*'s Behalf, when he was in Priſon; as alſo thoſe of the *Philippians* and *Corinthians*, in behalf of St. *Paul*; likewiſe the Prayers of Holy *Job* upon the account of his Friends, with whom upon his ſcore God was diſpleaſed.

But in Caſe it be lawful to beſeech the Saints which are upon Earth to intercede with God for us, why may we not do the like in regard of the Saints which are in Heaven? (for thus indeed do the *Romaniſts* argue.) I anſwer, in the firſt Place, Becauſe God has commanded that thoſe who are alive ſhould mutually pray for one another, and has promiſed that he will hear ſuch Prayers; but whether or no the Saints who are departed pray for thoſe who are alive, is not manifeſt from the Scriptures, neither is there any either the leaſt Command to be met with that we ſhould pray unto the Saints which are in Heaven, nor promiſe that our Prayers of this Nature will be acceptable either to God or the Saints, or any way advantageous to the Supplicant himſelf. Secondly, Becauſe every where in the Scriptures we have Examples of thoſe who are alive praying for the Living, as likewiſe of ſuch who deſire the Prayers of others in their Behalf, and do ingage themſelves to beſtow

Objection.

Anſwer.

on others the Charity of their Prayers; but there is not even the leaſt Foot-ſtep of any Example either in the Scriptures, or in the Primitive Church, of Invocating any one of the departed Saints. Thirdly, Becauſe we are perfectly well aſſured, that the Fellow-Soldiers of our Chriſtian Warfare here on Earth, whenever, whether by word or writing, we deſire their Prayers upon our account to our common Father, do perceive and underſtand what it is we would have them to do for us; but whether the Saints which are in Heaven have any Knowledge of what we are doing here below, or hear what we ſpeak, or, what is infinitely more, can ſearch out the obſcure Receſſes of our Hearts, ſo as they may fully underſtand whether our Prayers proceed out of a deceitful or an unfeigned Heart, this no mortal either does, or without a ſpecial Revelation can underſtand. Fourthly and Laſtly, We do not offer our Prayers to, or Invocate others in this Life to pray for us, but we intreat them, that they, together with our ſelves, would on our Behalf Invocate him who is alone to be Invoked; nor do we make it our Requeſt to them, that they would aſſume the Office of a Mediator on our Behalf, but that in Conjunction with us, they would thro' the common Mediator Jeſus Chriſt addreſs themſelves to God the Father.

But the Saints which are in Heaven are by the *Romaniſts* prayed unto in a quite different Strain; for *Aquinas 2. Secunda Queſt. 83. art. 4.* ſays, "Prayer is offered to the Saints, that thro' their Merits and In-"terceſſion, it may be render'd effectual; and *Bellarmine* in his ch. 20. of the *Bleſſed Saints*, tells us, "That the Saints, tho' at preſent they "neither for themſelves nor others merit any thing, yet by virtue of "what they have formerly merited, do they obtain what they petition "for, both upon their own and the account of others. Whereupon, ſeeing that both the ground upon which, as well as the manner after which, we requeſt thoſe who are alive to pray for us, is ſo very much different, and contrary to that of Invocating the Dead to become our Interceſſors, it is nothing ſtrange that the former ſhould be warrantable and advantageous, whilſt the latter is not only unprofitable, but alſo unlawful.

But let us return to *St. Chryſoſtom*: True it is, that in the Homily laſt quoted from *Jer.* 15. 1. he mentions alſo the Prayers of the Saints departed this Life. "Tho' *Moſes* and *Samuel* ſtood before me, *&c.* But it is to be remarked, that he ſpeaks not concerning them as of ſuch who were deceaſed, but upon Suppoſition that they were yet alive, or ſpeaking of them as if they were even then preſent; for ſpeaking concerning *Moſes*, "In caſe, ſays he, he were even now here preſent, and if *Sa-*"*muel* ſtood even now before me, *&c.* but here in this, and in many o-

ther

ther Places of the Works of this Father, what by him is said concerning the Prayers of those who are alive in behalf of the Living, 'tis customary with the *Romanists* to make use of it, as if it were spoken concerning the Saints which are in Heaven, still concluding any thing from any thing, rather than they will desert that Argument they have once undertaken to maintain.

5. The last place out of St. *Chrysostom* is for his Sermon upon the Martyrs *Juventinus* and *Maximus*; in which Sermon sustaining the part of a Panegyrist, he does indeed speak mighty things concerning the Intercession of these Martyrs with God, as also concerning the frequenting their Anniversaries; but concerning the Invocation of them, or that they were to be Invocated, not on Syllable. Now we do not indeed deny, but that St. *Chrysostom*, and many other Fathers both of this and the preceding Century were of Opinion, both that the Saints were in Heaven, and that they likewise there interceded with God, in behalf of the Church still militant here in Earth; but all this notwithstanding, that either St. *Chrysostom* did himself *Invocate the Saints*, or persuaded, taught, or approved of it, that others should do so, is the very thing we deny, and what the *Romanists*, though they leave no Stone unturned, will never be able to make out.

Besides St. *Athanasius* and *Chrysostom*, *Bellarmine* mentions of Cyril. St. *Cyril*, as a Patron of Saint-Worship. But that Book of St. *Cyril*'s which he specifies is of doubtful Credit, namely, his *Mystagogical Catechetism*, which *Haschelius* or *Velserus* (according to *Possevin*) says is to be met with in the Library at *Ausberg*, with this Title, *Five Mystagogical Catechetisms of* John *Bishop of* Jerusalem. Moreover, that Quotation by *Bellarmine* brought out of this Book, does not prove that the Saints are to be Invocated by us, but only that they intercede on our Behalf.

Lastly, Those Authorities which from *Theodoret*, *Bellarmine* produceth for the *Invocation of Saints*, are taken out of his History of the Fathers, and concerning the *Remedying the Dispostion of the Greeks*. But the Author of the History of the Fathers relates the Death of *Simeon*, and his Miracles after Death; but, according to *Baronius*, *Theodoret* died before *Simeon*; wherefore that History was no Composure of his. The Books also concerning the *Remed. Dis. of the Greeks* are of doubtful Authority, because *Nicephorus*, in his Catal. of *Theodoret*'s Works, makes no mention of them; and by reason that manner of *Invocation of the Saints*, which in those Books is allowed of, is quite opposite to those Opinions of *Theodoret*, which from his undoubted Works I have above produced, against the Invocation of Angels.

Thus

Thus therefore do you perceive with how little Sincerity and what ill Succeſs theſe *Greek* Fathers are by the *Romaniſts* employed in this Controverſy. Let us now take a view, whether or no they behave themſelves with more Candor and Integrity towards the *Latin* Fathers.

Obſervation. But firſt of all 'tis neceſſary we take notice, that ſome, and thoſe too of the more ancient, as well amongſt the *Greek* as *Latin* Fathers, did neither acknowledge our *Invocation of the Saints*, nor their Interceſſion for us, becauſe they did not believe the Saints were as yet admitted into Heaven. And this diſcovers to us the Reaſon why the Worſhip of Angels crept into the Church before that of Saints; namely, by reaſon it was always received as a Truth, even by thoſe who believed the Living had no Commerce with thoſe departed, nor thoſe departed any Perception or Knowledge of ſuch things as were tranſacted in this Life, that the Angels had the Care and Adminiſtration of humane Affairs committed to them by God. Secondly, 'Tis to be obſerved, that others alſo of the Fathers, as well *Greek* as *Latin*, (of all which *Origen* was the firſt) believed that our Concerns were under the Care not only of the Angels, but likewiſe of the Saints who were departed this Life; yet did they not thence conclude, that either Angels or Saints were to be Worſhipped or Invocated by us, tho' they interceded with God on our Behalf. Thirdly, It is likewiſe to be obſerved, that amongſt theſe Fathers of this ſecond Rank or Order, there were ſome who believed the Saints Triumphant in Heaven had a very particular Concern for the whole collective Body of the Church Militant here in Earth, and interceded for her, as underſtanding that ſhe groaned under the Preſſure of Perſecution, but yet without any Diſtinction or Cognizance of particular either Perſons or Affairs. And of this Opinion was St. *Auguſtine*; "For, ſays he, the Dead have the "ſame Regard for the Living, tho' they are altogether ignorant of "what they do, as we who are alive have of the Dead, tho' we be e-"qually ignorant of what they do. Beſides theſe, others there are who believed that the Souls of the Martyrs and Saints hovered about thoſe Places which were dedicated to their Memories, and both underſtood, regarded, and intereſted themſelves in the Concerns of the Livlng; yea, and to the Prayers of thoſe Perſons who offered up their Petitions at their *Memoriæ*, added thoſe of their own; and for this very reaſon were theſe Places where the Relicks of the Martyrs were depoſited thronged by ſuch who came there to offer up their Devotions. And this, of very Truth was the next Step to Invocation, and People were trained along from that to this by an eaſy and down-hill Path. But yet ſome of the Fathers of this 4th Century, when they had even thus far proceeded,

ceeded, did notwithstanding stop here, for tho' they were really of Opinion that the Saints did not only pray for them, but to their Petitions added those of their own, yet neither did they themselves *Invocate the Saints*, nor esteem it lawful for others so to do; no nor even the very Angels themselves, though they were much better assured that the Angels, rather than the Saints, were present with them, and that they understood and had regard to the Affairs of Mankind.

Of the Latin Fathers: Of Hilary.

Amongst these were St. *Ambrose* and St. *Hierom*, who by *Bellarmine* are produced as Evidences for the *Invocation of Saints*; for St. *Hilary* seems to have been of the same Opinion with St. *Augustine*. And his Evidence insisted on by *Bellarmine*, besides that it speaks only concerning Angels, makes nothing at all for our Invocation of Angels, though he says that our Infirmity stands in need of their Intercession. But, as before I have often said, tho' the Angels and Saints do intercede for us, yet that we should therefore Invoke them, is no conclusive Argument. But there is another Place out of St. *Hilary*, (which *Bellarmine* rather chose to hint at than produce) namely, out of his *Enarrations upon Psalm* 124. in which place St. *Hilary* does indeed say, that by the *Mountains about Jerusalem* are meant Angels, and adds, that in them there is no inconsiderable Protection; as likewise also in the Apostles, Patriarchs, and Prophets, or rather (as by way of Self-Correction he there speaks) in the Angels. But he does not say, that either the Patriarchs, or the Prophets, or the Apostles, or the Angels are to be Invocated: Nay, in case he had so said, he had not, according to the *Romanists* themselves, spoken what was Truth; For as to the Apostles, they were not yet born, and the Souls of the Patriarchs and Prophets were in the *Limbo* of the Fathers; in which place neither were they in a capacity to afford others any Assistance, neither ought they to be by others Invocated. But why does not *Bellarmine* subjoin what in that very Place of St. *Hilary* does follow, "The Pro-
"tection of the Angels is indeed much to be prized, but much better
"is that of the Lord, who in the Conclusion of the Gospel has told us,
"*I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World*. For, says St. *Hilary*,
"he is at hand, and whenever he is faithfully called upon, according
"to his Divine Nature is present with us. From which Words it is, in the first Place proved, that Christ is God, because wherever he is called upon, there, according to his Nature, he is present. Secondly, Because that Person ought alone to be Invocated, which, wheresoever he is Invocated, can according to his Nature be there present.

Of Ambrose.

As to what relates to St. *Ambrose*, it cannot be denied, but in that Book concerning *Widows*, he writes in this manner, "The
"Angels

" Angels and Martyrs, which are assigned us as our Guardians, and " who (as in that place it follows) can intercede for our Sins, are to " be prayed unto, as those who in their own Blood have, in case they " had any, washed away their own Guilts. But here I desire *Bellarmine* would satisfy me, in the first place, whether or no with S. *Ambrose* he does himself stand in doubt of the Martyrs having any Sins? And in the next place, whether with St. *Ambrose* he dares affirm, that the Martyrs have washed away their own Guilts by their own Blood-shed? Now in case through Incogitancy, or out of too great a Veneration toward the Martyrs, St. *Ambrose* might in one part of this Sentence a little trip, why not in the other part also? Nay, why not in both? And really, (so great a Deference do I pay to St. *Ambrose*) that I am verily persuaded, that in case he (like as St. *Austine*) had written Retractations, he would, in the very first place, have fixed a Note of Ignominy upon this Sentence, and quite expunged it out of his Writings; and indeed it is credible he has implicitly, and (as we say) in his Inclination done this, seeing in the first Book of his *Offices*, he thus delivers himself, " Some " People are themselves instructed before they instruct others, and re- " ceive that from their Instructors, which they again deliver to others; " which thing fell not to my Portion, who being hurried from the Bar " and Magistracy to the Mitre, I immediately fell upon instructing you " in those things which I my self had not learned. For so it fell out, " that I became an Instructor, before I was my self a Scholar, *&c.* Which to me seems an ingenuous Confession of a Person, who either acknowledges that he has, or otherwise is apprehensive least in some things he may have erred; especially in such things as he taught or writ whilst as yet he was but a Novice in Christianity, for his Baptism and Consecration immediately succeeded one another; nay he was a Bishop, however in Designation, before he was a Christian, as being baptized betwixt his Election and Consecration. Now this Book of his concerning *Widows*, seems to have been the first, and consequently the most undigested Product of his earliest Exercitations in Divinity. For in the Year next ensuing his Consecration, (as Tom. 4. p. 324, 327. *Baronius* from St. *Ambrose*'s own Words proves) he composed his Commentaries upon St. *Luke*; out of which Commentaries also *Bellarmine* either really has, or otherwise persuades himself that he has something, tho' of no great moment, which makes for the *Invocation of Saints*. Now in these Commentaries he takes Notice of his Book concerning *Widows*, as of a Tract formerly writ, namely, in his very Entrance upon his Episcopal and Christian Charge; whence it is that St. *Austine* tells us, " That St. *Ambrose* writ concerning Matters re-

lating

relating to the Church, even while he was ſcarcely initiated in Chriſtianity. And truly it is not much to be wondred at, that what he writ before he was well Catechiſed in Chriſtianity, ſhould not altogether reliſh of the Doctrines of it, or however that he ſhould not throughly and in every particular ſo write, as became a well-grounded Chriſtian and experienced Divine.

Upon which Conſideration it is but juſt that we ſhould allow, at leaſt in what relates to this Author, his ſecond Thoughts to be the beſt, and rather collect and make an Eſtimate from his later than from his earlier Writings, what was his Opinion concerning any Matter in Controverſy. Which thing, in caſe *Bellarmine*, tho' but out of Deference and Reſpect to St. *Ambroſe*, will allow of them, all is well again. For the very ſame St. *Ambroſe* now growing into Years, and better skilled, and more experienced in Matters relating to Theology, in that Oration which he compoſed upon the Death of *Theodoſius* the Emperor, and delivered in the Preſence of his Son *Honorius*, amongſt other things excellently well by him delivered, addreſſeth to God on this wiſe, "Thou, O Lord, art only to be Invoked, thou alone art to be ſought to, "that thou wouldſt vouchſafe to place him (that is, *Theodoſius*) amongſt "thy Sons. Behold here a moſt Emphatical Recantation! He does not now tell us, the Angels are to be ſued unto, the Martyrs are to be invoked; but Thou, O Lord, ſays he, art to be Invoked, and not only more eſpecially, and in the firſt place before, tho' together with others, but Thou, O Lord, alone art to be Invoked, that is to ſay, excluding all others as well Angels as Martyrs. And from this finiſhed and undiſputed Tract of St. *Ambroſe*'s, are we (in caſe we be not too ſevere upon him) to collect what was his real and genuine Opinion concerning the *Invocation of Saints*.

Let us therefore proceed to St. *Hierom*, which amongſt the Fathers of the Fourth Century, is the next Evidence *Bellarmine* cites for the *Invocation of Saints*; but all that out of him he is able to produce, is only one ſhort Sentence, and that too delivered by St. *Jerom* by way of a Rhetorical Apoſtrophe. For in his Epitaph upon *Paula*, writing in a Poetical ſtrain, *Paula*, ſays he, *adieu, and aſſiſt with thy Prayers the extreme old Age of him who is thy Votary*. Which Expreſſion, that it is not by St. *Jerom* ſo delivered, as that he was of Opinion *Paula* heard him, is apparent from St. *Jerom*'s own Words, in his Epitaph upon *Nepotian*; in which Epitaph he clearly expreſſeth himſelf after what manner he would be underſtood in that other Epitaph on *Paula*. "For (ſays he) whatever I ſhall ſpeak, becauſe he (that is, *Nepotian*) does not hear, he ſeems ſpeechleſs. And afterwards, "Since

of S. Jerom.

" we cannot converſe with him, let us never forbear to ſpeak of him. From which Expreſſion it ſeems to me next to Demonſtration, that tho' in that place (by *Bellarmine* produced) St. *Jerom* may ſeem to ſpeak to *Paula*, as though ſhe were preſent, and heard what he ſaid, yet this he did only after a Poetical manner, (for an Epitaph is a Poetical Subject) and not that he was of Opinion, that when he either ſpoke concerning, or to *Paula*, ſhe did really hear him: Wherefore, as it had been ridiculous in St. *Jerom*, after a ſerious manner, to commune with a Perſon who did not hear him, in like manner it had been much more ſo, ſeriouſly and in earneſt to Invocate her, who could not hear his Petitions. For tho' it does not follow, that becauſe the Saints hear us (ſuppoſing it true they do ſo) that therefore they are to be Invoked; yet can there not be a more irrefragable Conſequence, than that becauſe the Saints do not hear us, therefore are they not to be Invoked. And certainly, in caſe St. *Jerom* had given his Suffrage for the *Invocation of Saints*, he had in thoſe Tracts which he writ againſt *Vigilantius* openly and plainly diſcovered it. For ſeeing there are Three things which *Vigilantius* moſt eſpecially maintains;

1ſt, That the Martyrs or Saints departed are not to be Adored.

2dly, That none who are Departed do intercede for the Living.

3dly, That the Souls of the Saints and Martyrs are not preſent at the Places of their Interment, neither do they act as Advocates in Behalf of the Living.

Concerning the two laſt of theſe, St. *Jerom* with Zeal and much Warmth diſputes againſt *Vigilantius*; but touching the firſt of them, maintains no Controverſy; for even he himſelf denies, that the Souls of the Martyrs and Saints are to be Adored. And in caſe by Adoration he had not meant Invocation, aſſuredly he would not have omitted this ſo proper an Occaſion of diſtinguiſhing betwixt the Invocation and Adoration of the Saints, by aſſerting this latter of them to have been allowable, but the former unlawful; but neither in that place, nor any where elſe has he in any wiſe done this, and yet without all diſpute he would have done it, in caſe he had approved of the *Invocation of Saints*. And much more would he have done this, ſuppoſing it as a Doctrine to have obtained in the Church of that Age, or been publickly or commonly practiſed. And this, as I well remember, is the very thing which in my firſt Letter to you I did aver, when I granted that the Seeds of this Idolatrous Superſtition were ſown, and began to ſhoot up even in the times of St. *Auguſtine*; yet after ſuch ſort did I allow of this, as nevertheleſs in the mean time I denied, that St. *Auguſtine* was himſelf tainted with this Error, or that any ſuch Forms of *Invocating*

the Saints, as out of that ſpurious Book of *Meditations* you ſhewed me were, during St. *Auguſtine*'s time commonly entertained and publickly received in the Church; in the poſitive Denial of which very thing I ſtill perſiſt.

And as to what relates to S. *Auguſtine* himſelf, you your ſelf are pleaſed to acknowledge, that I have ſufficiently and ſolidly proved that Book by me laſt mentioned to be none of his. But, ſay you, what does it ſignify whether it be his or no, in caſe the ſame Opinions which are in it maintained are to be found elſewhere in St. *Auguſtin*'s Works? Indeed it will nothing at all avail, provided the ſame Opinions are to be met with in the genuine and undoubted Works of St. *Auguſtine*: Proceed we therefore to a diligent Diſcuſſion of thoſe Places which you tell us are alledged out of St. *Auguſtine* by thoſe who defend the *Invocation of Saints*. For as to what relates to St. *Chryſoſtom*, and St. *Jerom*, which you mention together with St. *Auguſtine*, and to others alſo of the moſt celebrated Fathers of the Fourth Century, whereof you make no mention, enough, I ſuppoſe, if not more than enough, has already been ſpoken.

1. The firſt place therefore of St. *Auguſtine* by you, as you perſonate a *Romaniſt*, alledged, is out of the Book concerning the *Knowledge of the True Life*; which is alſo by thoſe of *Levain* in their 6th Dialogue, quoted to the ſame Purpoſe. But with what Sincerity? when thoſe very Perſons of *Lovain*, *Cenſ.* Tom. 9. tell us, that Work is none of St. *Auguſtine*'s, as the Stile and other Circumſtances make it plain; and *Eraſmus*, in his ſhort Preface to that Book, ſays, "There is no Neceſſity "to give you Notice, that this Book is not St. *Auguſtine*'s, the Stile "more reſembles ſome *Jovinian*, or rather indeed one in the Paroxyſms "of a Fever; for in the Sixth Chapter he ſays, The Angels have "not only a Knowledge, but a Præſcience of all things: This argues "it to be the Exerciſe of ſome Monk, a Smatterer in Di-"vinity. Thus far *Eraſmus*. And *Bellarmine* reckons this Book amongſt thoſe, concerning which he ſays, he can pronounce nothing with Certainty, ſeeing neither *Poſſidius* nor *Bede*, in recounting the Works of St. *Auguſtine*, make any mention of it. *In his Book of Eccleſ. Writers.*

2. To this in your Catalogue ſucceeds the Book concerning the *Spirit and the Soul*, no way unlike the former: For that it is none of St. *Auguſtine*'s is ſufficiently plain, becauſe in the 37th Chap. *Boetius* is quoted, who was brought into the World a conſiderable time after St. *Auguſtine*; upon which, and alſo other accounts, it is rejected by *Trithemius*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Martin Delrio*, *Bellarmine*, and others of the *Romaniſts*.

3. The third place now follows out of the Book concerning *Baptiſm*, againſt the *Donatiſts*; in the 7th Book Chap. 6. of which Work, that place is indeed to be met with, and I am of Opinion it is the only one of that Nature, which is alſo quoted by *Bellarmine*, but not to prove that the Saints are to be Invocated by us, (for in that place there is no ſuch thing) but that they invoke God on our Behalf, that is, in general, for all the Members of the Church Militant, which above I have acknowledged, to have been the Opinion of St. *Auguſtine*.

4. The fourth Quotation is out of the Book of Queſtions upon *Exodus*, and (not in the 118th. according to your account) but in truth in the 108th Queſtion of that Book it is ſaid, "That God is render'd "propitious to us, by the Interceſſions of the Saints. But we are not now a diſputing, whether or no the Saints pray for us, but whether they are to be Prayed unto, or Invocated by us; neither (as I have more than once ſaid) allowing the former, will the latter follow.

5. The ſame Anſwer is to be returned to (what in the fifth place you take Notice of) St. *Auguſtine*'s Enarrations on *Pſalm* 85. and 88. in which places ſomething there is concerning the Prayers of the Saints on our Behalf, but for our Invocation of them, not any thing at all.

6. The ſixth Teſtimony is out of the Sermon on the Feſtival of St. *Stephen*; but I could wiſh you had a little more particularly expreſſed your ſelf, which Sermon it is you moſt eſpecially intend; for there are ſeven Sermons upon that Feſtival, either compoſed by, or however fathered upon St. *Auguſtine*; three whereof (namely, the Firſt, Fifth, and Sixth) have not the Capital *A* prefixed in the Front of them, which Capital Letter ſo prefixed, *Eraſmus* has advertis'd us to be the Characteriſtick to ſpecify the genuine Iſſue of St. *Auguſtine*. Now in the firſt of theſe Sermons there are theſe Words, (to which I ſuppoſe you refer) "Let us therefore recommend our ſelves to his (that is, to St. "*Stephen*'s) Prayers; for now he is much more effectually heard, in "behalf of ſuch who devoutly pray unto, or (as it is in the Margin) "worſhip him, who was then ſo well accepted in the behalf of thoſe "who ſtoned him. To which Words, were they without Controverſy St. *Auguſtine*'s, it would indeed be a Task of ſome Difficulty, to give a ſatisfactory Anſwer: But ſeeing this Sermon has not in the Front of it that Characteriſtick, which (as I ſaid) is the diſtinguiſhing Mark of St. *Auguſtine*, nor his Name prefixed to it, even in the *Lovain* Edition, it is not at all needful we ſhould concern our ſelves about what is, or is not expreſſed in it. I have likewiſe read over the ſix remaining Sermons on that Feſtival, but find nothing any way like this in any one of them. Indeed towards the cloſe of the ſecond, (which

is the first to which the Characteristick Letter is prefixed) I find our (that is) the true St. *Augustine* thus drawing towards a Conclusion, and saying, not like that counterfeit S. *Augustine*, We recommend our selves to the Prayers, but "Let us follow the Example of St. *Stephen*, let us "imitate our Fellow-Servant, let us copy after all the holy Martyrs. They were Men, they were our Fellow-Servants. Behold how altogether unlike is this to that other manner of speaking concerning the Martyrs, in how different a Method do we address our selves to them, with that Regard which is due to them! Like to this is what in the fourth Sermon, upon the same Festival, (which has also the same Note of its being genuine affixed to it) he speaks concerning Christ, "That "he prays for, and in us, and is prayed unto by us. For, says he, as "our Priest he prays for us, as our Head he prays in us, and as our "God he is prayed unto by us. In which Words (as to me it appears) he intimates a more than ordinary Difference between Christ, and all other, whether Saints or Angels. For the Angels may pray for us, so likewise may the Saints; but in us they cannot pray, nor ought either Angels or Saints to be prayed unto by us. For as Christ alone prays in us, because he alone is the only Mediator, so Christ alone, with the Father, and Holy Spirit, is prayed unto by us, because he only is God alone.

7. In the seventh place a Sermon preached on the Festival of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* comes under Consideration. But whether the First, Second, Third, Fourth, or Fifth (for so many there are, besides that preached the Day before upon the Vigil) your Paper determineth not. But I believe you intend either the First or the Fourth of these, because in the rest there is nothing that relates to the Worship or *Invocation of Saints*. Now the first of these is produced by *Bellarmine*, as an Evidence of the Religious Worship of the Saints, and that too most deservedly; for there in most express Words it is said, "That now the "whole Multitude of *Gentile* Believers on their bended Knees adore "the most blessed St. *Peter* the Fisherman, thro' Jesus Christ our Lord. So that according to this St. *Augustine*, the Saints are not only to be had in Honour and Reverence, which thing we likewise acknowledge; nay nor yet, what we deny, are they only to be Invocated; but to be Adored also, which I did not imagine the *Romanists* themselves would have allowed of; tho' to speak the truth, that kind of *Invocation of Saints* for which they so earnestly contend, is one kind of Worship or Adoration, which they dare not challenge as due to the Saints. For they are not ignorant of that Passage of St. *Jerom* against *Vigilantius*, "I do not say we worship and adore the Relicks of the Martyrs, no nor even the Sun "and Moon, neither Angels, nor Arch-Angels, nor Cherubim and "Seraphim,

" Seraphim, and every Name which is named in the preſent Age, and " that to come, leſt we ſhould ſerve the Creature rather than the " Creator. And again, " Who has at any time adored the Martyrs? " Who has accounted of Man as God? Much good therefore may it do *Bellarmine* with his St. *Auguſtine*, who teacheth that Man ought to be adored; nay who has not ordained St. *Peter* a Mediator betwixt us and Chriſt, but Chriſt a Mediator betwixt us and St. *Peter*; for he does not ſay, That the Multitude of the *Gentile* Believers Adore God the Father, but the Fiſherman St. *Peter*, through Jeſus Chriſt; for theſe Words, *Thro' Jeſus Chriſt*, ſeem to have Reference to the Word *Adore*, not to the Word *Believers*. For we are ſaid to believe *in* or *on* Chriſt, but we are not ſaid to believe *thro'* Chriſt. Wherefore the Senſe of theſe Words is this, The Multitude of the *Gentile* Believers adore *Peter* the Fiſherman, through Jeſus Chriſt; ſo that in this one Sentence, thus underſtood, there is a double Blaſphemy, namely, againſt God, and againſt Chriſt; and what way ſoever we underſtand or interpret it, it is guilty of a Blaſphemy againſt God, ſeeing, beſides God, it propoſeth to Mankind, and the believing *Gentiles*, another Perſon as the Object of their Adoration in (or as he expreſſeth himſelf) thro' Chriſt. But we have not ſo learned Chriſt, neither from Chriſt himſelf, neither from his Apoſtles, nor yet from our St. *Auguſtin*, who in his Book concerning *Paſtors* ſays, " The Angel who had ſhewn many " and wonderful things to St. *John*, was by him adored: but the Angel " withdrawing him from himſelf, and directing him to God, charges " him, See thou do it not, but worſhip him, for I am thy Fellow-Ser- " vant, and of thy Brethren. Therefore, according to the true St. *Auguſtine*, none of our Fellow-Servants, whether he be Saint or Angel, is to be Worſhiped. Wherefore this firſt Sermon upon St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* is none of St. *Auguſtine*'s; which thing *Eraſmus* and thoſe of *Lovain* have alſo obſerved; for neither in *Eraſmus*'s Edition is the Characteriſtick Letter *A*, nor in the Edition of *Lovain* is St. *Auguſtine*'s Name prefixed to it.

8. And by reaſon of the ſame Defect, the ſame thing muſt be ſaid of the fourth Sermon; tho' I cannot perceive what Inconveniency it would bring upon us, ſuppoſing we ſhould allow it to be genuine. For there being but two Paſſages which out of that Sermon either are, or can be produced; one whereof is, " Now in the Ce- " lebration of the *Memoriæ* of the Fiſherman, the Emperor falls down " upon his Knees: the other, " Let us therefore Reverence the Heads " of our Flock, if we deſire to enter into the Sheepfold of the Shepherd. From neither of theſe Places is the *Invocation of Saints* proved; for Reverence

verence is one thing, but Invocation another; ſo likewiſe, 'tis one thing to fall on our Knees, while we attend at the Solemnities of the Martyrs, and a quite different to adore the Martyrs themſelves. For it may by ſix hundred Teſtimonies of St. *Auguſtine*, and others of the Fathers, be made appear that the Ancients, when they made their Devotions at ſuch Places where the Memories of the Martyrs were celebrated, did not Invocate the Martyrs themſelves, but God. And leſt any of the *Gentiles*, or any Novice among the Chriſtians, not yet ſufficiently and perfectly inſtructed, might conjecture that the Chriſtians either worſhipped the Martyrs, becauſe they Adored God when they aſſembled at their Memories; or that they Invoked them, becauſe during the Celebration of the Holy Myſteries and Prayers their Names were recited; They are indeed, ſays St. *Auguſtine*, commemorated, but not Invoked. *City of God*, B. 22. ch. 10. What more expreſs? What more full, or of greater Authority, to give a Definitive Sentence in this Controverſy, in caſe either from Words, or by the Authority of St. *Auguſtine*, this matter is to be decided? But let us take what ſtill remains under Conſideration.

9. The next place you take notice of, is out of the *City of God*, B. 22. ch. 29. I ſuppoſe you intended ch. 9. for in ch. 29. neither is there any thing either for or againſt the *Invocation of Saints*. But in the 9th ch. ſomething there is concerning ſuch things which are ſaid to be performed by the Martyrs upon our account; but whether theſe things be performed thro' their Prayers and Interceſſions only, or by their Power alſo and Operation, is left as a matter undetermined; but concerning Invocation he ſays nothing at all.

10. Neither yet in his 2d Book againſt *Fauſtus* the *Manichean*, in which Book there are only 6 Chap. which I have read quite thro'; but you have mentioned the 21 ch. But in the 21 ch. of the 21 B. againſt *Fauſtus*, (which is the laſt Authority out of St. *Auguſtine* you inſiſt on) it is ſaid, "That the Martyrs are worſhipped by us, but with that Worſhip of "Charity and Communion, wherewith the holy Men of God, even in "this Life, are worſhipped; which, as I ſuppoſe, no Man will ſay is the Worſhip of Invocation, concerning which thing alone is our preſent Diſquiſition.

And thus (my dear *Ulitius*) to all thoſe Evidences which by you, perſonating a *Romaniſt*, are produced out of St. *Auguſtine*, to countenance the *Invocation of Saints*, I have in my poor Opinion given ſatisfactory Anſwers. But becauſe St. *Auguſtine* is not only to be vindicated againſt theſe, but likewiſe againſt all other Objections, which out of him are wont to be produced, even againſt himſelf; and becauſe

Bellarmine

Bellarmine seems to confeſs, that all thoſe Places which from St. *Auguſtine* are by you inſiſted on, are not ſo pertinent, or however leſs effectual, inaſmuch as he himſelf takes no Notice of any one of them, let us ſee whether theſe Authorities, which from the ſame St. *Auguſtine*, tho' not out of the ſame Places, *Bellarmine* himſelf does produce, be indeed more pertinent, and more concluſive. Now the two former Quotations (for there are only three of them) come not properly into this Diſpute.

1. For of the firſt of theſe Authorities (which is taken out of the 84. Tract upon St. *John*) theſe are the Words, "Therefore becauſe we "do not at the very Table after ſuch ſort commemorate them (that "is, the Martyrs) like as we do others who reſt in Peace, that we "ſhould alſo pray for them, but rather that they ſhould pray for us. Where in the firſt place we are by the by to take notice that thoſe who were departed, for whom the Church of that Age prayed, did reſt in Peace; and therefore Prayers for the Dead, according to the Ancient Church, did neither grant, nor ſuppoſe a *Purgatory*. And in the next Place, as to what relates to the Words themſelves, whatever may be collected from it, does all of it relate to the Interceſſion of the Saints on our behalf, not to our Invocation of them. For what in this Place he expreſſeth by (*We Commemorate*) is the very ſelf ſame thing with that which elſewhere he ſays, (*We make mention of their Names*;) therefore as the Expreſſion, (*We make mention of their Names*) in that other place, ſo (*We Commemorate*) in this, ought to be contradiſtinguiſhed from (*We Invocate.*)

2. To *Bellarmine*'s ſecond Teſtimony from St. *Auguſtine*, the ſame Anſwer is to be returned; that in theſe Words, namely, ('Tis diſhonourable to pray for a Martyr, to whoſe Prayers we ought to be recommended) St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaks not of our Invocating the Martyrs, but only of their interceding for us.

3. But the third place which out of St. *Auguſtine* follows in *Bellarmine*, if we conſider it barely by it ſelf, and apart from the Context, is of that ſort, that it may eaſily impoſe upon any unwary and inconſiderate Reader, ſo as to induce him to believe St. *Auguſtine* of another Opinion, than in truth he is. Now the Words, as *Bellarmine* recites them, are theſe, "I do not underſtand what Advantage it can be to "the Dead to have a Place for the Interment of their Bodies provi-"ded for them near to thoſe where the Memories of the Saints are ce-"lebrated, unleſs it be this, that while thoſe who are alive conſider "with themſelves where the Bodies of ſuch Perſons who have been "dear to them are depoſited, they may recommend them to the ſame "Saints as Patrons to undertake for them, and by their Interceſſions

"aſſiſt

" assist them with God. These Words are, I say, quoted by *Bellarmine*, from St. *Augustine*'s Book concerning the place we are to employ about the Dead, which Words, that I may not conceal what is really true, did at the first blush a little startle me, but (not being a perfect Stranger to what Credit was to be given to a Jesuite) I immediately consulted the Book it self, and read over the whole Passage, and indeed the entire Tract, once and again. And in the first Place I observe, that what by *Bellarmine* is joined together, St. *Augustine* has disjointed. For when, in what precedes those Words, St. *Augustine* had delivered his Opinion concerning the Cause and Reason of Sepulture, he subjoins, " Which thing, in case it be true, then indeed to have a place of In-" terment provided near the Monuments of the Saints, is an Indica-" tion of Kindness and Regard to the Funerals of their deceased " Friends; for in case it be commendable to see them interr'd, " it cannot possibly be less so, when we are curious about the Place " of their Interment. But tho' such kind of Consolations may be sought " after with respect to the Living, that hereby they may manifest their " good Will towards their Friends or Relations, I do not perceive " what Advantages do thereby accrue to the Parties deceased. Then after a Colon, or half-Period, it follows, " Unless it be upon " this account, that while those who are alive consider with themselves " where the Bodies of such as have been dear to them are deposited, " they may recommend them to the same Saints as to Patrons, " to undertake for them, and by their Intercessions assist them with " God. And this in very deed is the entire place as it lies in St. *Augustine*'s own Works, which differs from that of *Bellarmine* in this particular, that the Interment of the dead near to the Places where the Memories of the Saints are celebrated, is said, in express Words, to relate more to the Consolation of the Living, than to the Benefit of the Dead; but as the Period is repeated by *Bellarmine*, it is the Benefit of the deceased Party which seems alone to be sought after, from such a manner of Interment. And of a very truth great was the Benefit which by some Persons of those Ages was from hence hoped for in Behalf of the Dead, as if indeed the Martyrs had a greater Regard unto such who were interred near their Relicks, not only in that it was believed that they afforded a propitious Ear to such Prayers as were offered at their Memories, but that together with those who prayed in behalf of the Dead, they also conjoined their Intercessions. But seeing from many other Passages every where in his other Works, as also in several Places of this very Book, it is most apparent that St. *Augustine* was not of that Opinion, we must either acknowledge,

that St. *Auguſtine* within the compaſs of a very few Pages of the ſame Book, did moſt palpably contradict himſef, or otherwiſe that St. *Auguſtine* intended theſe Words in a Senſe quite differing from what *Bellarmine* would fix upon them. And I cannot otherwiſe chooſe but ſuſpect, that *Bellarmine* was conſcious to himſelf that he had perverted theſe Words from that genuine Senſe wherein St. *Auguſtine* had delivered them, otherwiſe in this place alſo, he had moſt certainly cried out, What more evident? as above he had done, with reference to that obſcure place of *Irenæus*. *Bellarmine* therefore was not ignorant, that the Senſe of theſe Words was quite different from what the Sound of them ſeemed to carry with it; but he flatter'd himſelf, that the leſs conſiderate Readers, and ſuch eſpecially who did not conſult the Author himſelf, would ſo apprehend them, as at the firſt hearing of them they ſeemed to import. For whoſoever ſhall with Application read over that whole Book concerning the Care we are to imploy about the Dead (out of which theſe Words are taken) will clearly perceive, that St. *Auguſtine* was the fartheſt imaginable from that Opinion, which from theſe Words, neither recited with Integrity, nor underſtood without Prejudice, *Bellarmine* labours to faſten upon them.

To the place it ſelf therefore do I make Anſwer. Firſt, That St. *Auguſtine* ſeems to deliver thoſe Words not as they contain his own, but the Sentiments of other Perſons; becauſe he himſelf both elſewhere, as likewiſe in this very Book, oftner than once affirms, that thoſe who are departed have neither any particular Regard for, nor Knowledge of the Concerns of this Life; but becauſe he underſtood that St. *Jerom*, and other Perſons of conſiderable Note and Eminency, were of another Opinion, therefore when in the former part of this Period he had, agreeably to his own Judgment, told us, that he could not perceive what Advantage it was to the Parties deceaſed, to have the Place of their Interment near the Memories of the Martyrs, what follows was by him ſubjoined according to other Mens Opinions; and that not by way of affirming any thing, but as of one that doubts, or that ſuppoſeth, and as it were concedes to ſomething, in complaiſance to others. For he who ſays he perceives not what Advantage it is to the Dead, to be thus interr'd, unleſs it be upon this account, does not affirm that any Advantage does really accrue to them, even upon this account; but rather intimates, that in caſe upon this account it be not uſeful, it is altogether inſignificant. And this, in good earneſt, was St. *Auguſtine*'s Opinion concerning the Interment of their Departed Friends near the Memories of the Saints, namely, that altho' to provide ſuch a Place for interring of the Dead,

was an Indication of Kindneſs and Regard to the Funerals of their deceaſed Friends and Relations, and further that from thence ſome Comfort might ariſe to the Living; yet notwithſtanding this, there was not from thence the very leaſt Advantage to the Dead themſelves; unleſs what other Perſons conjectured, might peradventure prove true, namely, that the Martyrs had a peculiar Regard for thoſe Perſons, who were interr'd near the Places where themſelves were entomb'd, above others; if indeed we do recommend them to the ſame Martyrs, as to Patrons, to be aſſiſted by their Prayers to God for them; which thing, ſays he, may nevertheleſs be performed, tho' they be not interred in ſuch Places. In which Words he ſeems to give a tart Reprimand to that Opinion which maintains, that the Martyrs have a very particular Regard for thoſe who are interred near the Places where their Memories are celebrated; and beſides, he again pretty plainly intimates his own Opinion, namely, that the Martyrs do intercede with God indifferently for all Perſons without Diſtinction, who by Prayers to God are recommended to them, to be aſſiſted by them.

2. From whence another reply to this Place of St. *Auguſtine* may be collected, and that too more accommodated to the very Words of this Period; namely, that thoſe who had the Place of their Interment near the Memories of the Martyrs are by the ſame Martyrs aſſiſted with God; not becauſe they are interred in thoſe Places, but becauſe by Prayers to God they are recommended to them; they are, I ſay, recommended to the Martyrs by Prayers, but it is by Prayers addreſſed to God, not to the Martyrs. For even thoſe very Perſons who, in thoſe Days, aſcribed unto the Martyrs and departed Saints a particular Care and Knowledge of ſuch things as were tranſacted here, did not for all that recommend themſelves and others to the Patronage of the Martyrs and Saints, by addreſſing their Prayers to them, but to God; like as we alſo are wont to beſeech God, that he would vouchſafe to lend a gracious Ear to thoſe Prayers which by other Perſons who are alive are addreſſed to him on our Behalf. So that from this Place, whether we take it in that Senſe which St. *Auguſtine*, or in that which St. *Jerom* underſtood it, the *Invocation of Saints* can no way be evinced; but only that the Saints are aſſiſting with God to thoſe who by Prayers to God are recommended to their Patronage. For ſuppoſing, tho' not granting, that like as the Angels, ſo alſo the Saints have the Care of our Perſons, and our Concerns, by God committed to their Charge, yet ſeeing they adminiſter this Province which by God is committed to their Charge, not according to their own, but to the Will of God; it is more agreeable both to Reaſon and Religion, that we ſhould both petition and wait for the Benefit of that Miniſtration (whatever it either is, or may poſſibly be) from the Maſter of the Servants, than from the Servants themſelves. For without all Diſpute it is lawful to beſeech God, that he would give his Angels Charge over us, to keep us in all our ways; but it is not therefore lawful to beſeech the Angels that they would keep us in all our ways; for neither did the Ancient Church before Chriſt (tho' they underſtood that the Angels were God's Miniſters for our Good) ever pray after this manner; and the ancient Church after Chriſt in the Synod of *Laodicea*, condemn'd ſuch who prayed after this manner: And whatever is concluſive againſt the Invocation of Angels, is more effectually ſo againſt the *Invocation of Saints* and Martyrs.

And theſe Conſiderations are, I am in good hopes, ſufficient to vindicate, not only St. *Auguſtine*, but likewiſe all the reſt of the Fathers of the Fourth Century,

as well *Greek* as *Latin*, (excepting Three or Four, where they expreſs themſelves not after a Dogmatical, but either after a Rhetorical or Poetical manner) from that Mark of Infamy, wherewith the *Romaniſts* endeavour to brand them, whilſt they labour to extort an Evidence from them, will they, nil they, in behalf of the Modern Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*. And in very deed, in caſe they had not quite abandoned all Modeſty, they never had ſo much as once made mention of St. *Auguſtine*, eſpecially in this Cauſe, whom they very well underſtood, to have ſhewn ſo very little Countenance to the *Invocation of Saints*, that he does not only deny the very thing it ſelf in expreſs Words, when he ſays, (which is above taken notice of) The Saints are indeed named in the Congregations and Celebration of the Holy Myſteries of the Church, but are not Invoked; but openly and on ſet purpoſe raſeth the very Foundations of this ſo corrupt a Superſtition, as ſoon as they were laid. For the *Romaniſts* will not deny, but that the very Ground-work of *Invocation of Saints* is bottom'd on a ſort of Perſwaſion, (whether true or falſe) that the Saints departed are even yet concerned in the Adminiſtration of humane Affairs, and are propitious to the Prayers of ſuch who Invoke them, or however one way or other underſtand what it is they are petitioned for. But St. *Auguſtine*, tho' he grants that the Saints do indeed in general intercede for us, (as being ſuch who throughly taught by their own Experience underſtand that we fight under Chriſt's Banner, and are expoſed to many and great Difficulties and Dangers) yet (as before I have ſaid) he is ſo far from granting that they are propitious to our Prayers, that he expreſly, and with great Aſſurance, and frequently affirms, That the Souls of the deceaſed are in ſuch Places, where they perceive not thoſe things which are performed by, or happen to Men in this Life. And how then, ſays he, ſhould they know their own Tombs, or whether their Bodies lie expoſed in open Air, or be interred? And in caſe they be altogether ignorant whether they have Tombs or not, then, ſay I, how ſhall they be propitious to thoſe Petitions and Supplications which are offered up at their Tombs? St. *Auguſtine* was indeed aware, (as before I have advertized) that ſome Perſons, in thoſe Ages wherein he lived, both of great Learning and Piety, were of another Opinion, namely, that the departed Saints did not only pray for all Men in general, but in particular for ſome Perſons with a greater Ardency and Intention than for others, and farther, that they were preſent at, or intereſted in, the Petitions of thoſe who prayed, and that they heard and recommended them to God, tho' as yet they had not ſo far advanced, as that either they themſelves actually did, or affirmed that others ought to *Invocate the Saints*. But becauſe S. *Auguſtine* foreſaw the Superſtructure which would be raiſed on this ſandy Foundation, and from what he ſaw already practiſed conjectured how far in a ſhort time they would advance, beyond what at preſent was attempted; upon this Conſideration, tho' he do not by Name reprimand the Authors themſelves, yet does he with Zeal and Weight argue againſt thoſe ſo dangerous Opinions of theirs, (almoſt quite throughout that whole Book concerning the Care we are to employ about the Dead.) "For "ſays he, let every one reſent what I deliver as he pleaſes; In caſe the Souls of "thoſe who are departed were intereſted in the Affairs of the Living, my own pi-"ous Mother would be my conſtant nightly Viſitant, who compaſſed Sea and Land "that ſhe might live with me. But what the H. Pſalmiſt ſings, is moſt certainly true, "*When my Father and my Mother forſake me, the Lord taketh me up.* If therefore our Pa-"rents have forſaken us, how are they intereſted in our Cares and Concerns? And in "caſe our Parents are not thus intereſted, who is there beſides amongſt the Dead,

"who

" who have any Perception of what we may either do or ſuffer? And preſently after, " How, ſay he, can we ſay they were well provided for, who were taken hence " before the Days of Calamity came upon them, in caſe after Death they are touched " with thoſe Misfortunes which attend Humanity? Why did God promiſe it to *Joſiah* " that moſt Pious Prince, as a very conſiderable Benefaction, *Behold therefore I will gather* " *thee unto thy Fathers, and thou ſhalt be gathered into thy Grave in peace, and thine Eyes* " *ſhall not ſee all the Evil which I will bring upon this Place, and upon thoſe who ſojourn in* " *it.* All theſe things does St. *Auguſtine* in that place deliver, from which he at laſt draws this Concluſion, by me before mentioned, " Therefore are the Souls of the de- " ceaſed in ſuch Places where they perceive not thoſe things which are performed by, " or happen to Men in this Life. Of which Concluſion, this is the neceſſary Conſequence, either that St. *Auguſtine* did not believe that the Saints were to be Invocated, (which is both true, and worthy St. *Auguſtine*) or otherwiſe he believed thoſe were to be Invocated, who neither ſaw, heard, nor underſtood any of thoſe things, which were tranſacted, ſpoken, or thought of; which is not only falſe, and incongruous, but Folly and Madneſs, and therefore perfectly incredible concerning a Perſon of St. *Auguſtine*'s Learning and Character.

But now tho' ſo many, and ſuch clear Evidences out of St. *Auguſtine* himſelf, on his own Behalf do more than abundantly vindicate him, even from the very Suſpicion of this Error, there is yet over and above remaining one place more, and that too ſo celebrated, and ſo every way accommodated to the utter Extirpation of all ſorts of *Invocation of Saints*, that I muſt not by any means omit it. The *Romaniſts* (as you underſtand) when they cannot otherwiſe give ſatisfactory Anſwers to the Authorities brought from the Holy Scriptures, and the Fathers; are wont (as before I ſaid) to diſtinguiſh between Invocation Supreme, Direct, and Abſolute, and Invocation Subaltern, Indirect, and Relative; and the former of theſe they indeed tell us, is due to God alone, and with regard to that the Scriptures and Fathers ought to be underſtood, when they ſeem to ſpeak either for the Invocation of God alone, or againſt the *Invocation of Saints*; but the other, namely, the Invocation Subaltern, Indirect, and Relative, (to wit that Invocation whereby one Perſon Invokes another, that he would intercede in his Behalf to a Third Perſon) may and ought to be offered to Angels, and to the Saints likewiſe. But when to this we object, that this is neither better nor worſe, than to ordain Angels and Saints as Mediators betwixt God and Men, when St. *Paul* in moſt expreſs Words does acknowledge as but one God, ſo in like manner but one Mediator between God and Men, namely, the Man Chriſt Jeſus; here again the *Romaniſts* diſtinguiſh between a Mediator of Redemption, and a Mediator of Interceſſion; and affirm, that there is indeed but one only Mediator of Redemption, but that there are many of Interceſſion.

Let us therefore conſider whether St. *Auguſtine* were of this, or an Opinion quite different from it, who in his 2d Book ch. 8. againſt *Parmenian*, repeating thoſe Words of St. *John*, 1 Joh. 2. *Brethren, I write this unto you, that you ſin not, and if any Man ſin we have an Advocate with the Father Jeſus Chriſt the Righteous*, immediately adds, " but " if he had ſaid, theſe things have I written unto you, that ye ſin not, and if any Man " ſin, you have me an Advocate with the Father, and I will intercede for your Sins, " (like as in a certain Place *Parmenian* has aſſigned the Biſhop a Mediator between " God and his People) what good and faithful Chriſtian would endure this from him? " Who would account of him as of an Apoſtle of Chriſt, and not as Antichriſt? For all " Chriſtians mutually recommend themſelves to one another's Prayers; but that Per- " ſon for whom no one does intercede, but he does himſelf intercede for all Men, this " Perſon is the one only and true Mediator. For the Apoſtle S. *Paul*, tho' under the Head " he be a principal Member, yet even he recommends himſelf to the Prayers of the

Faith-

" Faithful; nor does he make himself a Mediator between God and the People.- For " if St. *Paul* were a Mediator, as also the rest of his Fellow-Apostles; even St. *Paul* him- " self would be at a Loss how to account for these Words of his own when he says, " *For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.* These are in that Place the Words of St. *Augustine*, where he expressly speaks of Christ the Mediator, (not only as he is the Mediator of Redemption, but as he is also the Mediator of Intercessions) of Christ, I say, a Mediator of Intercession, or concerning such a Mediator who is to be invoked, that upon our accounts he would Invoke and beseech God; and yet from St. *John* and St. *Paul* he concludes, that there are not many, but one only Mediator even in this Sense. And hence it is, that (being by the Widow *Proba* requested that he would instruct her how she ought to make her Prayers to God) in that Epistle which he writ to her concerning Prayer, and the manner of it, he makes not even the least mention of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, but proposeth to her the Lord's Prayer, as the Form and Rule of her Devotions. " For, says he, " altho' we may make use of other Expressions, which the good Disposition of the Peti- " tioner does frame, either by way of Preface to render itself more apparent, (or, as I " think it should be read more ardent) or by way of Conclusion does incline to, to enlarge " his Devotions; yet in case we pray aright and agreeably, we say nothing else than " what is contained in that Prayer of our Lord's. But in that Prayer there is nothing concerning the *Invocation of Saints*, or the Invocation of God thro' the Saints. But you will say, neither is there any thing concerning the Invocation of God thro' Christ. Yes certainly; for how is it possible for any Man to come unto God, or to make our Addresses to him as our Father, unless it be in and thro' Christ? And what here in this Prayer Christ does teach us implicitly, he has elsewhere taught us distinctly and expressly, as *John* 14. v. 13, 15, 16. where he promiseth that he will give us whatsoever we shall ask either of him, or of the Father in his Name. In which Words we are taught both to Invocate Christ himself as God; as also to Invocate God thro' Christ, as thro' a Mediator. But no where are we taught either to *Invocate the Saints* themselves, or to Invocate God thro' the Saints. Which thing, in case it had been either necessary or profitable, most certainly neither had Christ, when he delivered to his Disciples a Form of Prayer, omitted it; nor had St. *Paul*, who *Acts* 20. 20. testifies, that he *had kept back nothing that was profitable, which he had not publickly taught*, neglected it; nor lastly, had St. *Augustine*, when he instructed the Widow *Proba*, how with greatest Advantage she might make her Prayers unto God, concealed this from her. Neither had Cardinal *Peron* himself told *Casaubon*, "That never in his whole " Life-time had he Invocated any one of the Saints, save only when " in Publick Processions he joined with the rest in that usual Suffrage, *Pray for us*; which Passage concerning Card. *Peron*, our *Andrews* Bp. of *Winchester*, a Man of most undoubted Credit, and likewise a most learned Prelate, and of Primitive Conversation, does write from *Casaubon*'s own Relation, a Person likewise no way to be distrusted. Behold therefore how great the Force of Truth is, which sometimes extorts a Confession from its avowed Adversaries. For amongst all the *Romanists*, who has at any time shewn himself a more powerful, and (as with those of his own Profession he is famed) a more successful Defender of the *Invocation of Saints*, than Cardinal *Peron*; Who against our K. *James* affirms and defends this Invocation, if not as a thing absolutely necessary, yet however as most beneficial, and to be practised by all such who desired to be accounted Catholicks? And yet even this self same *Peron* confesseth, that he never once Invocated any one of the Saints, save only for Fashion-sake, and that he might not scandalize others. With what Conscience then could he pay so little regard to that thing, which he believed to be most beneficial? or with what Integrity does he so vigorously maintain that Doctrine, which he thought of no moment, and preacheth and re-

C. Peron's *Confes.*

Bp. Andrew's *Posthumous Works.*

com-

commendeth it to others, as a matter of the greateſt Concern? Namely, with the ſame Integrity and Conſcience wherewith another great Cardinal (to wit, *Bellarmine*) for four entire Books together, and the greateſt part of the fifth pompouſly argues for inherent Righteouſneſs, and the Merits of good Works, as if they either were, or might be of ſuch Perfection, that we might by them be compleatly juſtified, and putting our ſelves upon them, we might with Aſſurance appear before the Tribunal of God himſelf in his moſt ſevere Judgment. And yet after this ſo laboured a Diſputation, he at length concludes, That by reaſon of the uncertainty of our own Righteouſneſs, and the Danger of Vain glory, it is by much the ſafeſt courſe to repoſe our whole Confidence ſolely on the Mercies and Goodneſs of God. Which Concluſion, what is it elſe but a Confeſſion, that throughout the whole preceding Diſputation, he wittingly and wilfully labours to recommend an uncertain and dangerous, rather than a moſt ſure and ſafe way to Eternal Salvation? And aſſuredly *Peron*, in caſe he did not, ought to have made uſe of Expreſſions near upon the ſame with theſe in his Confeſſion to *Caſaubon*, namely, that in regard of the Uncertainty of that Knowledge which the Saints have (with reſpect to thoſe Affairs which are tranſacted here below) and in Conſideration of the Danger of Idolatry by *Invocating the Saints*, it is the ſafeſt courſe thro' Chriſt only to Invocate God alone.

Invocation of Saints, when it begun in the Church.

And that the Ancient Church, even down as low as the fourth Century, thus practiſed, is well nigh acknowledged. For *Pereſius*, in his 3d part concerning *Traditions*, confeſſeth, that from the times of *Cornelius*, that is, after the 250th Year of Chriſt) Interceſſions of the Saints were mentioned with Honour in the Writings; and from the times of S. *Baſil* (that is, about the Year 370.) Invocations were ſo likewiſe. Whence by the way it is to be remarked, that the Argument which is drawn from the Saints interceding for us, to our Invocating them, is not concluſive, ſeeing that according to *Pereſius* his Computation, the opinion of the Saints Interceſſions for us, preceded that of our Invocating them an hundred and twenty Years. But ſuppoſing that *Pereſius* ſhould ſay they were both of them at the ſame time, always in the Church, altho' the one was ſooner the other later mentioned in Authors; I do, in the firſt place, deſire to be informed by him, how it does, or can poſſibly appear that any Opinion or Practice did ſo many Ages ago always prevail in the Church, concerning which, amongſt ſo many *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* not one, before the ſeveral Ages of *Cornelius* and *Baſil*, has recorded any thing, nor made the leaſt mention of it in their Writings? And then again I deſire *Pereſius* would inform me, if both or either of theſe Opinions had from the beginning obtained in the Church, as an Apoſtolick Tradition, and derived down to us from Apoſtolical Perſons, how it ſhould come to paſs that the moſt Primitive amongſt the Ancient Fathers (which from *Sixtus Senenſis* I before mentioned) ſhould be of opinion, that the Souls of thoſe departed were not in Heaven, but in ſuch a Place, where they neither could hear the Prayers of thoſe who Invocated them, nor intercede with God on their behalf, by reaſon they neither as yet were, no nor before the Conſummation of the Age to come, ſhould they themſelves be made Partakers of the Beatific Viſion. About therefore the middle of the 3d Century, (*Origen* being the Author of it) the Opinion concerning the Interceſſion of the Martyrs with God, crept firſt into the Church; and afterwards towards the Concluſion of the 4th Century, the Invocation of the ſame Martyrs, by ſome particular Perſons (the Ice being firſt broke by the Orators and Poets;) but this was not introduced without ſtrong Oppoſition, from Perſons of the greateſt Note and Character, both of that and the next ſucceeding Age, as more eſpecially from *Epiphanius*, and S. *Auguſtine*, as likewiſe from S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Jerom*, S. *Chryſoſtom*, and *Theodoret*: So that before the 6th Century after Chriſt, it did prevail to that degree, as to be received by the publick Practice of the Church. And then at the long run by *Gregory the Great*, Pope of *Rome*, was the *Invocation of the Saints* annexed to, and incerted into the publick Litanies of the Church; but it was not then grown to that Exorbitancy, to which we now ſee it advanced. For notwithſtanding the *Romaniſts* whilſt they argue for it, tell us, that by *Invocation of the Saints*, they underſtand nothing more than that the Saints ſhould intercede with God in their behalf; yet from the common Practice, from the Forms both of Publick and Private Prayers publiſhed in print, and from Pictures and Images which they call the Books of the Laity, it is in every place openly to be ſeen, that they cheriſh in their Boſoms a quite different opinion, or however that they would have it by the Commonalty believed at another rate; namely, that the Saints are to be Invocated not barely as Interceſſors, but as the Givers and Liberal Diſpoſers of every good Gift; which things are, in very deed, cuſtomarily petitioned for with greater Frequency and Aſſurance from the Saints, and more eſpecially from the Bleſſed Virgin, than either from God or Chriſt.

And

And why should not the ignorant and unlearned Commonalty order their Practice at this rate? when *Gabriel Biel*, a Schoolman of great account, in the 8 Lect. of his Exposit. of the Canon of the *Mass*, writes in this manner, "Our Heavenly Father has granted to the most B. Virgin the one "half of his Kingdom, (which thing was prefigured in *Esther*, to whom *Assuerus* gave half of his "Kingdom) for seeing there are two Jewels of the highest value in the Heavenly Crown, to wit, "Justice and Mercy, God has reserved to himself Justice, and Mercy he has reigned to the V. "*Mary*. And *Bernardine*, in that Book of his, which he entitles *Mariale*, says, "It concerns us to ap- "peal from the Bar of the Divine Justice to the Bar of Mercy, which belongs to the V. *Mary*.

And those vain Imaginations which they publish in their Writings, they likewise to the Life exemplify in their Pictures and Images. For I my self have, in a Convent of *Franciscans*, which is at *Antwerp*, as also in another Convent of the same Fraternity, which is at *Bruges*, seen a Piece most exquisitely painted, and exposed to publick view; in one part whereof stands Christ, and in another the Virgin Mother. Christ is drawn standing upon his Feet, in an upright Posture, with a sower, terrible, and threatning Aspect, and in his Right hand stretched out brandisheth a burning fiery Thunderbolt, as tho' he would forthwith destroy the whole World, and were just upon the very point of taking a final Vengeance upon wretched Mankind, but that his more merciful Mother is at the Elbow of her enraged Son, and catching hold of his Right hand stops the Violence of his Fury just as it strains it self to the utmost, and is in its full Career, which thing she is prevailed upon to undertake by St. *Dominick* and St. *Francis*, who towards the lower part of this Draught on their bended Knees, with lift up Eyes, and Hands stretched out, not towards Christ but towards *Mary*, seem to Invocate her, that according to the Authority of a Mother she would command her Son (for at this rate do they usually express themselves) that he would not in his Indignation destroy Mankind. Behold here a pleasant, not silent, but vocal, nay eloquent Instructor of the Laity! Whereby they are more effectually admonished, than 'tis possible they should be by any Expressions, that *Mary* rather than Christ, rather than the Son the Mother is to be Invoked, as being better stored with Bowels of Mercy and Compassion, and more indulgent to Sinners, and more enclined and readier to succour Sinners than Christ. And indeed it is much to be lamented, that at the foot of this ingenious Picture, tho' alone, and by its self it is sufficiently instructive, that pious sententious Expression of *Bernardine*'s, "It concerns us from the Bar of the Divine Justice "to appeal to the Bar of the Divine Mercy, which belongs to the V. *Mary*, is not by way of Inscription or Title subjoined in Golden Capitals. For nothing can either be drawn, or fancied which could more emphatically express the Design and Intendment of this Picture. Or rather, that I may speak with all possible regard concerning a matter of such moment, (for even these Trifles have relation to what is of greatest weight) it is in good earnest to be lamented, that the Hearts of Christians (which God himself lays claim to as his purchased peculiar right [Prov. 23. 26.] should by these and such like pious, nay much rather impious Cheats, gradually and insensibly be alienated from God and Christ; and even almost the entire Body of the Devotion and Worship of the Church of *Rome*, transferred from God to the Saints, and from Christ to the V. *Mary*. So that like as St. *Athanasius*, with reference to the Age wherein he lived, formerly said, "That the "whole Christian World stood amazed to consider it self was become *Arian*, so likewise the *Roman* World of this present Age does, or may justly wonder, and stand amazed to consider it self become *Marian*. For as those who in that Age called themselves Christians, were nevertheless *Arians*; so these who now a-days glory in stiling themselves Catholicks, that is, the very best of, and indeed the only Christians, are notwithstanding in reality *Marians* rather than Christians.

But I have forgot that I am writing a Letter, and that you are a Person crouded with multiplicity of Business; and besides this, not so altogether a Stranger, and unexperienced in these very Controversies, that you should stand in need of my self, or any one else to be your Instructor. I make it therefore my Request, (most Courteous and Learned *Ulitius*) that you would in such wise accept of these worthless Considerations, not as tho' they were by me committed to writing with any design of Instructing you in something whereof you had hitherto been ignorant, but that I might lay before you my own Sentiments, together with the Practice and Determination of the Ancient Church, in one of the most considerable Heads of Controversy betwixt us and the *Romanists*, and submit it to your most Learned Censure. In the doing whereof, in case I have been beyond good manners tedious, you, according to your wonted Candor, will I hope freely pardon both this, and what other Errors I've in this Paper escaped

Your most Obsequious Friend,

FINIS George Morley.